HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLVII APRIL, 1954 NUMBER 2

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

THE SINGLE EYE [1]

HENRY J. CADBURY
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

IN THE LITERATURE of Judaism and Christianity 'evil eye' is a term for niggardliness. This probably is a usage independent of the term 'evil eye' of magic. It belongs rather to that nomenclature of what I may call physiological psychology that is so conspicuous, especially in the Old Testament.[2] Emotions are located in different parts of the anatomy — pity in the bowels, anger in the nostrils, and so forth. The eye is, among other things, the seat of niggardliness as in the phrase of the book of Tobit: "Let not thine eye be grudging when thou doest alms." [3]

The phrase evil eye uses in Greek the adjective *πονηρός*. It may be either attributive or predicative. An example of the latter is Matt. 20:15 when the employer says to the workman who criticizes the generous treatment of some of his fellows, "Is thy eye evil?"

It need not be expected that every such idiom will have an opposite that exactly matches it, or one that occurs with like frequency.[4] Whatever would be the opposite of hot nostrils, stiff

[1] This paper was suggested by reading the recent monograph of Edlund mentioned in the note below but the position presented is of long standing and not unique. It expands what I have said in The Peril of Modernizing Jesus, 1937, 53f.; and may be regarded as an attempt to meet the need for a commentary which I mentioned in An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the N.T., 1946, p. 47.

[2] The best exposition of this use of the various parts of the body known to me is in Aubrey R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1949, 39–88 (on the eye, see pp. 49–51). See also the works cited by Johnson, op. cit. p. 9, note 3. Cf. A. Rosenzweig, Das Auge in Bibel und Talmud, Berlin, 1892 (on greed, illiberality, etc., pp. 31–33).

[3] 4:7 *καὶ μὴ φθονεσάτω σου ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν σε ἐλεημοσύνην*; 4:17 repeats verbatim. The lacuna in Codex Sinaiticus includes both passages.

[4] The New Testament illustrates the way in which words which are not literal or etymological opposites can become habitually so used, e.g. *ἀδικία* vs. *ἀλήθεια*, *πιστεύω* vs. *ἀπειθέω*.

neck, to harden the heart or to shut up one's bowels (of mercy), the literal opposite for the good quality is rarely found as verbally exact antithesis for the terms used in peiorem partem. They would be cool nostrils, limber neck, soften the heart, open the bowels. In the same way one need not expect the equal currency of good eye to match evil eye, though it does occur. The available natural alternatives in the language would be to move over to the sheer adjective of character, without the physiological noun, or even with it. If one should use instead the purely formal opposite adjective it would be a tour de force, and sometimes if one uses the physiological noun at all it is equally far fetched.

The problem of opposites arises when contrast is to be expressed. For example in the passage from Matthew's parable just quoted the employer's generosity is to be contrasted with the envious parsimony of the employee's remark. The passage runs, "Or is thy evil because I am good?" The word good (ἀγαθός) is chosen as the standing opposite of evil (πονηρός). It is applied to the owner and not to his eye.[5] It is, however, much too general an adjective.

The characteristic Hellenistic Greek words for generousness in giving are the adverb ἁπλῶς, or the noun ἁπλότης. They occur abundantly in Jewish and Christian Greek in this sense. Therefore in the well known other gospel passage where the evil eye is mentioned the opposite is expressed by the root adjective ἁπλοῦς 'single,' as it is usually translated. The passage runs (with slight differences between Matthew and Luke): "The eye is the lamp of the body. If the eye is ἁπλοῦς the whole body is full of light; if the eye is πονηρός the whole body is full of darkness." [6]

Obviously the method of expression is here determined by the further fact that there is a parable about the eye and a lamp, and by the simile of the lamp, which gives light if lit and leaves dark-

[5] Unless, by a syncopation like that of the comparatio compendiari, the Greek means because my eye is good.

[6] Matt. 6:22, 23 = Luke 11:34–36. This has been subjected to elaborate examination by Conny Edlund in his monograph and doctoral dissertation with quite different results: Das Auge der Einfalt (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XIX), 1952. See the review in the Journal of Biblical Literature 72, 1953, pp. 204–5. Attention may be called also to the remarks of C. J. Cadoux in Expository Times 53, 1942, p. 254 in a controversy on the evil eye in which C. Ryder Smith and J. Duncan Percy also take part, ibid. 53, pp. 181–182; 54, pp. 26–27.

ness if not lit. The opposite conditions of a lamp require the retention of the word eye in both halves of that contrast. Otherwise the saying could have been couched in more lucid and more idiomatic terms than the Greek now displays.

The Greek translator of Proverbs for example meeting in his original the terms each separately and with no need for verbal contrast or for association with a parable or simile could paraphrase. "He that hath an evil eye hastens after riches" (28:22) becomes in Greek *ἀνὴρ βάσκανος* κτλ., where the adjective perhaps straddles the meaning of malicious or envious man and the quite common sense of magician or sorcerer. Elsewhere in Proverbs "He that hath a good eye" (22:9) becomes in Greek "He that pities the poor" *ὁ ἐλεῶν πτωχόν*.[7]

In Ecclesiasticus on the other hand both of these expressions are found in independent passages quite literally rendered "An evil eye is envious over bread" (14:10, *ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς φθονερὸς ἐπ'ἄρτῳ*, cf. 14:8), or, "Remember that an evil eye is a bad thing" (34(31):13, *κακὸν ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς*), and "with a good eye" (32(35):8, 10, *ἐν ἀγαθῷ ὀφθαλμῷ*), twice in a context of generous giving.[8]

In the gospel passage the use of *ἁπλοῦς* intended to clarify the idiom has come in our time to dim it. The literal translation 'single' does not suggest in English the meaning generous. The passage tends to be misunderstood of singleness of purpose. The unsuitableness of the other adjective 'evil' for this contrast is ignored, though Jewish and Christian Greek had appropriate ways of referring to divided loyalties, and came in time I think to use just those terms in contrast to the Greek use of singleness meaning generosity.[9]

This misunderstanding is furthered or bolstered by the sequel in Matthew. Immediately following in that gospel is the other Q passage: "No man can serve two masters, for either he will

[7] The former phrase is identically translated at Prov. 23:6. The Hebrew phrase is literally "one good of eye."

[8] These passages are sometimes differently numbered and are not all identically represented in the Hebrew.

[9] Barn. 19:11 = Did. 4:7 *οὐ διστάσῃς δοῦναι*, Hermas, Mand. 2:4 *μὴ διστάζων τίνι δῷς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῷς*, 2:6 *μηθὲν διακρίνων, τίνι δῷ ἢ μὴ δῷ* (with *ἁπλῶς* in the context of both passages), Sim. 9:24, 2f. *ἀδιστάκτως . . . ἁπλότητα*. Cf. I Clem. 23:1 . . . *ἁπλῇ διανοίᾳ · διὸ μὴ διψύχωμεν*.

hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon" (6:24). But is it certain that this sequel points to Matthew's supposed understanding of single eye as undividedness? I think here, as often, the key to the sequel is in its final word — mammon, and that allows us to bring the phrases about the eye, back as they usually are in other passages, to greed or covetousness.

In Matthew the preceding passage also is monetary, — on laying up treasures in heaven and not on earth (6:19–21). Thus if we may judge by context Matthew did not miss the meaning of the good and single eye when he placed the passage between one which recommended treasures in heaven (i.e. generous alms), and one which condemned the service of mammon.[10]

The context in Luke is quite different. This section follows in that gospel the other parable about a lamp: "No one after lighting a lamp puts it in a cellar or under a bushel, but on a stand, that those who enter may see the light" (11:33). This context has no bearing on the meaning of single or simple. Here the association is between objects, not ideas. Nor do the different conclusions to our present parable refer to its ethical premise. They also operate in the area of light and darkness, though they are striking illustrations of the divergence of Matthew and Luke, as a pessimist and an optimist diverge. Matthew the pessimist continues: "If then the light in you is darkness, how great is the darkness!" Luke chooses the opposite picture: "Therefore be careful lest the light in you be darkness. If then your whole body is full of light, having no part dark, it will be wholly bright, as when a lamp with its rays gives you light." [11]

If the meaning of ἁπλοῦς here suggested is correct, the intent of the parable is clear enough — the preference of generosity to niggardliness; and then no elaborate explanation is needed, nor recourse to Semitic roots or to Biblical theology. The passage seems to me one where unnecessary philological research is indulged in simply because the student fails to see that the phrasing

[10] Even the next nearest sections of Matthew deal with the self-renunciation of fasting (6:16–18) and the freedom from anxiety about food and clothing (6:25–32).

[11] For this and other examples of the contrast see H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, 1927, p. 267.

is due to the exigencies of a parable, which, using the word eye with the adjective evil in the familiar sense of niggardliness, must retain for contrast the word eye and add a Greek adjective which while not the usual opposite of evil is its opposite in this connotation.

This does not mean that the parable permits easy or exact translation into English, or into other modern languages. I suspect that here as elsewhere this difficulty of translation is the real cause for misguided exegetical darkening of counsel. It is part of our limitation to feel that what we can't translate we don't understand. Separately one could do as the Greek translator of Proverbs does and use a complete paraphrase for the phrases; but the parable requires the word eye because of the comparison with light or darkness in the body as controlled by a lamp. All this means that no literal transfer into English is possible. We in our culture express generosity by the open palm, its opposite by the closed fist.[12] Beginning with this we should have to alter all the rest of the parable.

Much the same kind of play on light, luminaries and psychological terminology is expressed by a poem of Francis William Bourdillon, but it only shows how impossible it is to transpose the Gospel saying in any literal way into our idiom:

> The night has a thousand eyes
> And the day but one,
> Yet the light of the bright world dies
> With the dying sun.
> The mind has a thousand eyes
> And the heart but one,
> Yet the light of a whole life dies
> When love is done.

In summary we may say: Matthew and Luke attribute to Jesus a detached saying whose Greek wording is too similar to be independent. Its original context is unknown. It is a condemnation of miserliness over against generosity. It falls therefore into that commonest of synoptic areas of Jesus' teaching — ethics, and has that characteristic negative emphasis on freedom from self-

[12] Cf. Did. 4:5 Be not one who stretches out his hands to receive but shuts them when it comes to giving.

seeking. It employs the traditional psycho-physical usage of the eye and that leads to the metaphor of the body as the area and of the lamp as the determinant of light and darkness.

While the traditional phrase "evil eye" was intelligible enough to remain in Greek, its opposite seemed to require a more explicit adjective with eye than 'good.' The most definite adjective in Hellenistic Greek for liberal or generous seemed to be ἁπλοῦς with its noun ἁπλότης as in Romans 12:8: "he who contributes (let him do so) with liberality," and its adverb ἁπλῶς [13] as in James 1:5 "God who gives to all men generously." The combination with eye is hardly to be found elsewhere,[14] but it is neither to be assigned to a subtler origin nor given abstract psychological profundity not characteristic of the synoptics, nor abandoned as hopelessly obscure, though at least in English the whole parable permits no simple translation. It is regrettable that a phrase once selected to clarify the meaning has in modern times been allowed to make the saying more obscure. This outcome illustrates in another sense for exegetes the parable's later words: "Beware lest the light that is in thee be darkness." "If then the light that is in thee be darkness how great is the darkness!"

[13] The new edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, 1925(–40), grudgingly accepts the meaning for the noun only indirectly, and for the adjective and adverb not at all, though the latter at least is common. The noun ἁπλότης occurs three times in the section on the collection for the saints in 2 Cor. 8–9. That ἁπλῶς often idiomatically emphasizes πᾶς is shown by H. Riesenfeld, Coniectanea Neotestamentica 9, 1944, 33–42, though he finally decides that in James 1:5 it goes with διδούς. I have not attempted in this article to distinguish the various shades of meaning in this group of words, as suggested for example by the discussion of M. Dibelius, Der Brief des Jakobus (Meyer, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das N.T.[7]) 1921, 76f., or to conjecture by what process of development they came to mean liberal, generous, ungrudging, or the like, but only to vindicate their reference to the general notion which such words convey in English.

[14] A doubtful exception is a variant in Test. XII Patr., Test. Issachar 3:3 πορευόμενος ἐν ἁπλότητι ὀφθαλμῶν. But the adjective occurs alone of the economic virtue, ibid. 4:2 ὁ ἁπλοῦς χρυσίον οὐ πλεονεκτεῖ. According to the English translation by R. H. Charles of the Ethiopic translation of the Book of Jubilees 41:28 (the Latin translation of this passage is missing) the phrase singleness of eye is used of Judah's intention to punish Tamar. But E. Littmann translates "Frommigkeit," and in any case the context is not definite enough to elucidate the phrase.

ASPECTS OF THE "GREAT" PERSECUTION *

G. E. M. DE STE. CROIX

NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD

THE 'GREAT' PERSECUTION, of the years 303 to 312/3, requires thorough reconsideration. This paper will discuss certain features of the persecution, and, without attempting to present a complete picture, will suggest some modifications in the received view.

1. THE EDICTS OF PERSECUTION

In this section it is necessary, for the sake of clarity, to go rapidly over some familiar ground.

The First Edict (hereafter referred to as 'E 1') was apparently issued (*datum*) on the 23rd February 303, on which day the church opposite the imperial palace at Nicomedia was dismantled. Next day the edict was posted up (*propositum*). The probable contents may be summarized as follows: —

I. (a) All Christian churches (and, it appears, any house in which the Scriptures might be discovered) [1] were to be destroyed.[2] (b) All copies of the Scriptures and other liturgical books were to be surrendered and burnt, and all church plate and other such property was to be confiscated.[3] (c) All meetings for Christian worship were prohibited.[4]

II. Persistent Christians were apparently deprived of the capacity to

* I am much indebted to Professors N. H. Baynes, A. Momigliano and particularly A. H. M. Jones for help, encouragement and criticism, and to Professors E. G. Turner and Claire Préaux for replying to questions on papyrological matters. They must not be held responsible for any errors which remain or for the opinions expressed. I also wish to acknowledge a special debt to the works of Hippolyte Delehaye, who did so much to advance the study of the Passions of the martyrs as historical sources. References to Passions are to the editions mentioned in Appendix I below.

[1] See Optat., Append. II, pp. 200, 202 (ed. C. Ziwsa, CSEL XXVI): 'ubi scripturae inveniuntur, (et) ipsa domus diruitur.'

[2] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. VIII 2.4; Mart. Pal. Praef. 1; 2.1; Optat., Append. II, pp. 198–9; cf. Lactant. De Mort. Pers. 12.

[3] Eus. HE VIII 2.4; MP Praef. 1; Optat., Append I, pp. 186–8; II, p. 199; Augustine c. Cresc. III 27.30; Conc. Arelat. I, Can. 13; and several Passions cited later.

[4] Eus. HE IX 10.8; and the Passions of the martyrs of Abitina and Philip of Heraclea.

bring actions in the courts; [5] those who possessed juridical privileges [6] were to lose them; [7] and οἱ ἐν οἰκετίαις (probably those members of the imperial civil service who were not technically soldiers and would mostly have been imperial freedmen) [8] were to be reduced to slavery.[9]

The results of E 1 will be discussed presently. The Second and Third Edicts (EE 2 and 3) can be disposed of briefly now: their effects have already been admirably summarized by Baynes in his masterly chapter on the persecution in the Cambridge Ancient History.[10] E 2, ordering the arrest of the Christian clergy,[11] was probably issued during the spring or early summer of 303, as a consequence (if we may believe Eusebius) of political disturbances in Melitene and Syria, in which the Christians were apparently believed to be implicated. There is no valid evidence that this edict was ever promulgated in the West. In regions where Christians were plentiful, its enforcement seems to have put an intolerable strain on a rudimentary prison system, intended to provide not for convicted criminals undergoing sentence but merely for accused persons awaiting trial. Ordinary criminals, according to Eusebius, were positively crowded out. The government, therefore, took advantage of the *vicennalia* of Diocletian, which were celebrated either in September or in November, 303,[12] to issue an amnesty to the incarcerated Christian clergy, granting them pardon on condition they sacrificed.[13] This was E 3. The local authorities evidently lost no time in ridding themselves of their unwelcome guests. Some of the clergy gave in, and others were

[5] Lact. MP 13.1; cf. 15.5.

[6] I.e. senators (*clarissimi*), those of equestrian status (*perfectissimi*, *egregii*), decurions, veterans, and to some extent soldiers.

[7] Lact. MP 13.1; Eus. HE VIII 2.4; MP Praef. 1. Thus the privileged classes would become liable to torture and the more savage punishments normally reserved for the lower orders.

[8] Cf. the *Caesariani* of the Valerianic persecuting edict (Cypr. Epist. LXXX 1). See Jones in J. Rom. Stud. XXXIX (1949) at p. 46; Baynes in Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 666 and nn. 1–4.

[9] Eus. HE VIII 2.4; MP Praef. 1.

[10] XII 666–7.

[11] Eus. HE VIII 6.8–9; cf. MP Praef. 2.

[12] Opinions still differ regarding this date, but it is not necessary to discuss the question here. Contrast W. Seston, Dioclétien et la Tétrarchie I 49–51, with W. Ensslin in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc., 2te Reihe, VII ii, 2423–4.

[13] Eus. HE VIII 6.10; MP Praef. 2. Despite the language of the former passage, it seems unlikely that torture was prescribed as a penalty for recusants.

tortured into compliance; but if we may generalize from a striking passage in Eusebius's Martyrs of Palestine,[14] it appears that practically all those who remained firm were compelled to go through the motions of sacrificing, protesting the while, and then released, or merely dismissed with the information that they were deemed to have sacrificed.

The Fourth Edict (E 4) ordered all inhabitants of the empire to sacrifice to the gods,[15] on pain of death. E 4 cannot be dated exactly, but it was probably issued in January or February, 304, for it had apparently not reached the proconsul of Africa by February 12th, but was being enforced in the Balkans by March.[16]

2. The nature and consequences of the First Edict

Since the edict and rescripts of Gallienus in the early 260s, recorded by Eusebius,[17] the Christian Church (or churches) had received a certain measure of toleration and recognition — how complete, and according to what constitutional principles, there is fortunately no need to discuss here. By E 1 the government forbade the collective practice[18] of Christianity by attacking the churches, books and services of its adherents, and it inflicted special penalties upon members of the upper classes and imperial civil servants who refused to abandon Christianity; but for the ordinary individual — provided, of course, he retained no religious writings and attended no services — merely 'being a Christian' (the *nomen Christianum*) was visited with only one penalty: deprivation of the use of legal process.

According to Lactantius,[19] Diocletian insisted that 'eam rem

[14] 1.3–4. Cf. the 14th 'canon' of the episcopal letter of Peter of Alexandria (p. 84 and n. 44 below).

[15] Eus. MP 3.1: *θύειν τε καὶ σπένδειν*. The records of martyrdoms suggest that offering incense or pouring a libation could be accepted as sufficient.

[16] See Baynes in Cl. Quart. XVIII (1924) at pp. 189–92. It should, however, be realized that of the Balkan martyrdoms discussed by B. only those of Agape, Chione and Irene (March and April, at Thessalonica) are securely dated to 304. For an outline of the views adopted here about the divisions of the empire among the tetrarchs, see Appendix II below. For a criticism of the theory about the origin of E 4 advanced by Baynes, see Appendix III below.

[17] HE VII 13; cf. 30.19; VIII 1.1–6. On this very thorny question, see esp. the excellent summary of Baynes in Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 655–6.

[18] See esp. the edict of Maximin of 313 (Eus. HE IX 10.8), where the whole persecution is summed up in the words, *τὰς συνόδους τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐξῃρῆσθαι*.

[19] MP 11.8.

sine sanguine transigi.' This isolated statement has often been construed in an exaggerated sense, and some modern writers have gone so far as to conclude that E 1 altogether forbade the infliction of the death penalty.[20] This view, which is intrinsically improbable, is definitely disproved by reliable contemporary evidence of executions of Christians who disobeyed the specific clauses of the first section of E 1 (as reconstructed above), by refusing to hand over their Scriptures or by holding services.[21] Yet there is no trace of any lesser punishment having been laid down for disobedience to the provisions of the first part of E 1. It seems most likely that for such offences — which the government might reasonably have expected to be rare — no specific punishment was prescribed by the edict. The public would naturally assume that the death penalty was liable to be inflicted on any obstinate recusant who openly defied the orders of a governor in such a matter; [22] and this impression might be expected to have a wholesome effect in securing obedience. 'Mortuus fueras, si non illas invenisses,' said Victor the municipal clerk to Silvanus the *fossor*, of the church of Cirta, when the latter produced some of the church plate.[23] Instructions may have been given to the provincial governors not to resort to capital punishment at all if they could help it; but further than this the evidence forbids us to go. The emperor who had already issued the ferocious edict against the Manichaeans [24] would hardly have been squeamish in his attitude towards Christians who were guilty of open defiance of his orders.

Except during the persecution of Decius, and to a smaller extent in that of Valerian, the Roman government had adhered,

[20] E.g. H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton, Eusebius, II 272: the death penalty would have been 'a violation of the First Edict.'

[21] See Appendix IV below.

[22] Cf. CTh XVI 5.34 (398), where the death penalty is specifically prescribed for Eunomians and Montanists who fail to hand over their heretical books.

[23] Optat., Append. I, p. 187.

[24] Mos. et Rom. leg. coll. XV 3.1, in E. Seckel and B. Kuebler, Iurisprud. anteiust. reliq.[6] II ii, 381–3, or F. Girard, Textes de droit rom.,[6] 602–3. The date is probably 31st March 297: see Seston in Mél. A. Ernout (1940) 345–54. The greater severity with which Manichaeans were treated was no doubt due to their being regarded as agents of a hostile power, as well as religious offenders; but much of Diocletian's invective against the Manichaeans would have applied equally to the Christians.

ever since the time of Trajan at least, to the wise principle that Christians were not to be sought out: 'conquirendi non sunt.'[25] This principle was not yet to be abandoned, save in respect of the two groups (the privileged classes and οἱ ἐν οἰκετίαις) who had been specially noticed by the edict, and those instituting legal proceedings. It seems unlikely that any widespread inquisition was carried out among the two special categories, since additional machinery would have been required for this; but it was easy to apply a test in court to intending litigants, to discover which of them were Christians.[26] (This may explain the choice of the penalty to be imposed on the ordinary Christian: it was when initiating court proceedings that he could most easily be exposed).

The time-honored method of deciding whether a given person was a Christian was the 'sacrifice test,' as it will be called here: the individual concerned was asked to sacrifice, offer incense, or make a libation, to the gods or the emperor.[27] Since we find the sacrifice test applied on several occasions, before the issue of E 4, in a manner not directly authorized by E 1, it is necessary to define its purpose more precisely. Its primary aim had always been not to expose Christians but to give those falsely accused of Christianity a chance to clear themselves in a universally recognized manner. The government, as a rule, took action against Christians only in response to popular clamor or individual delation, and the offence it punished was *being* a Christian, up to the moment sentence was pronounced, not *having been* one. Provided the Christian was not also guilty of some specific crime such as treason, by word or deed, he could obtain 'veniam ex paenitentia,' as Trajan put it,[28] by sacrificing, to show that he had apostatized from Christianity. The sacrifice test was thus essentially a convenient method by which a suspected person could demonstrate that he had ceased to be a Christian, or had never been one. It

[25] Pliny Epist. X 97.2.

[26] See Lact. MP 15.5.

[27] There seems to be no good evidence from the Great persecution of attempts to make accused Christians curse Christ (as in Passio Polycarp. IX 3) or swear by the emperor's genius or τύχη (as in Id. IX 2; X 1; Passio Scillitan. 5; Passio Apollon. 3).

[28] See n. 25 above.

was a privilege which a wrongly suspected or accused person, or a Christian prepared to apostatize, might wish to demand. A humane judge might make a practice of urging accused Christians to sacrifice as a means of saving themselves. When, from the time of the Antonines and Severans onwards,[29] the judicial torture of free men belonging to the lower classes became customary, it was only too likely that the sacrifice test would on occasion be used, or rather misused, combined with torture, to force Christian confessors to become apostates. But that was far from being its original object. If we may trust his own account of his procedure, Pliny imposed the sacrifice test not on confessors but only on those who said they were not Christians.[30]

Only upon the issue of E 4 did Diocletian and his colleagues abandon the principle, *conquirendi non sunt*, and in effect provide, by the universal imposition of the sacrifice test, for the public exposure of all Christians, who must then suffer the extreme penalty. It is obviously wrong, however, to take the application of the sacrifice test during the Great persecution as proof that it is E 4 which is being enforced, as is commonly done. The appearance in a Passion of a demand (or invitation) that an accused Christian 'sacrifice to the gods,' even if there is reason to think it was actually made, is by no means conclusive proof that E 4 was being invoked, for, as we have just seen, such a demand had long been usual in trials of Christians, and we know that it was revived in 303, in both East and West,[31] after the publication of E 1, but before E 4 could have been issued. Only an order to sacrifice 'in accordance with the imperial decree' is conclusive — provided there is good ground for thinking the phrase was actually used and has not been added by a hagiographer as a stock formula. The hagiology of the fourth and subsequent centuries came to be written with diminishing restraint and increasing contempt for historicity; and the stories of the martyrs of the Great perse-

[29] The exemptions in Cod. Just. IX 41.11.pr.; cf. 1 (and see Dig. XLVIII 18.15.1; 18.16.1; 18.21; 22.6.2; XLIX 5.2; 16.7; L 2.14), show that the practice was already well established by the reign of Marcus. The situation under the Severi onwards is well known: see Mommsen, Röm. Strafr. 406–8. For the 4th century, Dig. XXII 5.21.2 is illuminating.

[30] Pliny Epist. X 96.3,5.

[31] There is evidence for Syria, Palestine and Numidia: see below.

cution were, as we should say, 'written up,' according to a pattern which became ever more standardized.[32] Refusal to comply with a demand to sacrifice, with or without a reference to an imperial decree to that effect, became a stock feature and was included in virtually all Passions, even of martyrs who suffered under emperors other than Decius or the tetrarchs.[33]

It will be profitable to examine all the reliable detailed accounts we have of martyrdoms taking place between E 1 and E 4. From the West, we have nothing but the Passions of Felix of Thibiuca and of the congregation of Abitina, which are quite straightforward, the martyrs concerned being executed for direct disobedience to E 1. These documents call for no comment now. From the East, we have only [34] the descriptions in Eusebius's Martyrs of Palestine of the deaths of Procopius, Romanus, and Alpheus and Zacchaeus, which we may now consider.

The Martyrs of Palestine contains the earliest and most authentic version of the story of Procopius, the Long Recension (*L*) being at this point much more informative than the Short Recension (*S*).[35] The reason for the arrest of Procopius is obscure: it may or may not have taken place in consequence of E 2. When Procopius was brought before the tribunal at Caesarea on the 7th June 303, the governor first ordered him to sacrifice to the gods, and then, when he refused, to pour a libation to the four emperors. He tactlessly replied by quoting with approval the famous lines of Odysseus in the Iliad against a multiplicity of rulers, and was immediately beheaded for treason. In view of what has been said above about the insertion of a reference to E 4 in virtually all Passions, it is interesting to find that even in the first of a series of legendary elaborations of the Passion of

[32] See esp. Delehaye, Les passions des martyrs; Les légendes hagiographiques[3].

[33] See e.g., Delehaye, Les passions 241–2.

[34] The Passion of Philip of Heraclea, of which we possess only a Latin translation, contains valuable material and seems to depend ultimately on the account of an eye-witness (though not the official Acta); but it has been so heavily embroidered, as regards its dialogues, that it is unsafe to use it for present purposes. The order to sacrifice mentioned in Eus. HE VIII 6.2 can be explained as by A. C. McGiffert in his note ad loc., on p. 327 of his translation of Eusebius.

[35] 1.1–2. Lawlor and Oulton, at the end of Vol. I of their Eusebius, conveniently print side by side admirable English translations of *S* and of a composite version (from the Greek, Latin and Syriac) of *L*.

Procopius the execution is represented as taking place under an edict which ordered everyone to sacrifice or be put to death [36] — that is to say, under E 4, which was certainly not issued until months after Procopius's martyrdom.

On the 17th November 303, still before E 4 had been published, a Palestinian named Romanus, while present at Antioch, saw with indignation men, women and children (among whom were evidently many Christians) 'going up in crowds to the idols and sacrificing.' [37] Romanus intervened to rebuke the sacrificers, and was immediately arrested and sentenced to death, either for an act of rebellion or because his speech to the sacrificers included statements technically treasonable. According to *L*, the governor was commanding sacrifice; but it is hard to believe that he did anything more than invite the people to make a public demonstration of loyalty in this manner.

An official order to sacrifice also enters into the martyrdom of Alpheus and Zacchaeus on the same day, presumably at Caesarea.[38] Eusebius has just made indirect reference to EE 2 and 3, and it is often assumed that these men, one a reader and exorcist of Caesarea and the other a deacon of Gadara, had been arrested under E 2. This is certainly not true of Alpheus, a bold volunteer, whom Eusebius describes as being arrested in consequence of a public intervention, like that of Romanus, to prevent mass apostasy. Zacchaeus was apparently arrested at Gadara, and it seems very probable that he too had been guilty of some special provocation, although the details did not come to Eusebius's knowledge. Alpheus and Zacchaeus were ordered to sacrifice but refused, saying they acknowledged only one God, the king of all, whereupon they were beheaded, presumably for making a statement technically amounting to treason.

Mass apostasies similar to those rebuked by Romanus and Alpheus no doubt took place all over the empire during the year 303. In particular, Christians who belonged to the upper classes, and consequently had more to lose if they remained Christians,

[36] See Delehaye, Les legendes hag.[3], chap. v, at pp. 124–5. Cf. the similar addition to the Passio Felicis, given in Anal. Bolland. XXXIX (1921) 272, § 11.

[37] MP 2.1. If the churches were only now being destroyed, as *S* states, the authorities had been very slow to put E 1 into operation in Syria.

[38] Eus. MP 1.5. *L* is very much fuller.

would think it prudent to forestall attack by 'voluntarily' making a public demonstration of their abandonment of Christianity. We know from Cyprian that in 250, upon the publication of the persecuting edict of Decius, very many African Christians publicly apostatized of their own accord before they were even arrested or interrogated or ordered to sacrifice: in two very striking passages in his De Lapsis,[39] Cyprian represents them as rushing in crowds to clear themselves of suspicion by sacrificing.

At the other extreme from these voluntary apostates are the 'voluntary martyrs,' as they will be called here: men who deliberately and unnecessarily went out of their way to seek martyrdom, like Romanus and Alpheus. Voluntary martyrdom was officially condemned by the orthodox, except in the case of those who were seeking to redeem an earlier lapse; [40] but it was evidently by no means infrequent during the second and third centuries, and an astonishingly high proportion of the martyrs of the Great persecution whose stories we know in detail were volunteers. The curious phenomenon of voluntary martyrdom deserves closer attention than it has hitherto received, and it will be dealt with elsewhere. The subject will also come up again later in this paper. It is sufficient now to record the fact that Mensurius, bishop of Carthage at the beginning of the Great persecution, had to forbid Christians to honor those who 'gave themselves up of their own accord and volunteered the information that they possessed Scriptures which they would not hand over, when no one had asked them to do so.' Mensurius also referred, rather uncharitably, to 'criminals and debtors to the treasury, who took advantage of the persecution to rid themselves of a life burdened with many debts, or hoped to purge themselves and (so to speak) wash away their crimes, or at any rate to make money and live like fighting-cocks in prison on the charity of the Christians.' [41]

[39] 7; 8. Cf. Eus. HE VI 41.11–12.

[40] As in Peter Alex. Epist. Can. (see n. 44 below) 8; contrast 9, 10. Among the many other passages condemning voluntary martyrdom are Passio Polycarp. IV (cf. Eus. HE IV 15.7–8); Clem. Alex. Strom. IV iv. 16.3 to 17.3; x. 76–77; VII xi. 66.3 to 67.2, ed. O. Stählin; Cypr. Epist. LXXXI; Passio Cypr. 1.6 (endorsed by Aug. c. Gaudent. I 31.40); Conc. Illib., Can. 60; cf. Lact. MP 13.2,3.

[41] Aug. Brev. Coll. III 13.25, in the translation of A. H. M. Jones, Constantine and the Conversion of Europe 106. But this allegation may have been a commonplace: cf. the Passio Theodoriti 3 ('audivi te esse fisci debitorem, et ideo mori

3. The First and Fourth Edicts: contrasts between East and West

Modern writers [42] commonly speak as if the 'dies traditionis' under E 1 were everywhere distinct from and succeeded by a very greatly intensified phase of the persecution, the 'dies turificationis' brought about by E 4. Those who hold this view might have taken warning from the fact that Lactantius never refers to E 4 at all, and that Eusebius mentions it only in his Martyrs of Palestine,[43] not in his Church History.

In the East, the characteristic form of apostasy is always conceived as *sacrificatio* or *turificatio*; there seems to be no evidence at all that *traditio* was regarded as a religious offence. This is true even of the earliest document we possess which deals officially with the problem of the Eastern *lapsi* of the Great persecution: the 'Canonical Letter' of Peter, bishop of Alexandria,[44] dating from Easter, 306, in which, if anywhere, we might expect to find some emphasis on *traditio*. The fourteen 'canons' of this letter are concerned entirely with the question of apostasy in the persecution, in various forms. Although the nature of the act constituting the lapse is seldom specified, it is obviously assumed throughout the document to be something in the nature of sacrificing, offering incense, or partaking of food previously offered to idols; there is no reference whatever to *traditio*, direct or indirect. The canons [45] of the Council of Ancyra, of (probably) 314, the next document of the same kind which has survived, also

---

desideras ne reddas quod debes'); Hippol. Elench. IX 12.7, ed. P. Wendland (Callistus, the future bishop of Rome, unable to repay money he had embezzled, voluntarily sought martyrdom).

[42] E.g. Baynes in Cl. Quart. XVIII (1924) at p. 189, and in Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 668; M. Besnier, Hist. rom. (Roman vol. IV of Hist. gén., ed. G. Glotz) 328; G. Costa, in Ruggiero, Diz. epigr. di antich. rom. II 1860–1; L. Duchesne, Early Hist. of the Christian Church II 79; cf. W. Ensslin in Pauly-Wissowa, 2te Reihe, VII ii, 2487.

[43] 3.1. Our remaining contemporary authority for the persecution, Constantine (ap. Eus. Vita Const. II 51), does not distinguish between the various 'sanguinary edicts.'

[44] Migne, PG XVIII 467–508; Routh, Rel. Sacr.[2] IV 23–45; A. P. de Lagarde, Reliq. juris eccles. antiq. 63–73; cf. E. Schwartz in Gött. Nachr., phil.-hist. Klasse, 1905, at pp. 166–75.

[45] C. J. Hefele — H. Leclercq, Hist. des conciles I i, 301–26; Mansi II 513–22. The first nine canons deal with the *lapsi*.

ignore *traditio* completely, although many of them are concerned with the problem of the *lapsi*, and these go into some detail on the different ways in which sacrifice could be carried out. None of the participants in the controversies which vexed the Eastern churches in the fourth century accuses his opponents of *traditio*, although Meletius was later accused by his adversaries, absurdly enough, of *sacrificatio*.[46] In none of the Passions from the Eastern provinces is *traditio* made an issue. In that of Agape and her fellow-martyrs of Thessalonica,[47] Chione complains that her religious books and papers have all been taken away from her, and Irene is accused of preserving διφθέρας καὶ βιβλία καὶ πινακίδας καὶ κωδικέλλους καὶ σελίδας, γραφῶν τῶν ποτε γενομένων Χριστιανῶν τῶν ἀνοσίων. Doubtless all Christians retained their sacred books when they could. But it appears that giving them up, or allowing them to fall into the hands of the authorities, was not regarded as a sin in the Eastern part of the empire. We have one positive piece of evidence to this effect, in the Passion of Philip, bishop of Thracian Heraclea.[48] Here we are told that Philip himself agreed to hand over the church plate to Bassus, the governor, but refused to give up the Scriptures. However, the deacon Hermes, who was later martyred with Philip, 'diu antea verberatus, ingressus est ubi vasa omnia et scripturae laterunt' — and the narrator shows no sign of disapproval of Hermes' action but continues to treat him with the greatest respect and sympathy. Finally, it is significant that there appears to be no Greek term in the ecclesiastical writers for *traditio*.

In the West, the situation is totally different. If we compare with the canons of the purely Eastern Council of Ancyra those of the Western Council held at about the same time (August 314) at Arles, we are at once struck by the fact that its canons [49] make no reference at all to apostasy by sacrificing or burning incense. The persecution had ceased in the West more than nine years before the Council met, and only two canons [50] are concerned with offences committed during the persecution: they deal only with

[46] Athan. Apol. c. Arian. 59.1; Socr. Hist. Eccles. I 6.
[47] §§ 4–6.
[48] See, on this Passion, n. 34 above.
[49] Hefele-Leclercq, op. cit. 280–95; Mansi II 471–4.
[50] 13 (*traditio*); 14.

false accusations, and with *traditio*, in its different forms, by those 'qui scripturas sanctas tradidisse dicuntur vel vasa dominica vel nomina fratrum suorum.' Here even *traditio* of the *vasa dominica*, like the other two forms of *traditio*, is treated as a religious crime, justifying the removal of the delinquent from the ranks of the clergy; whereas Philip of Heraclea, as we have seen, saw nothing wrong in handing over the church plate immediately he was ordered to do so. In the Donatist controversy, which convulsed the African church henceforward, *traditio* is the one issue which dwarfs all others, as far as the Great persecution is concerned. In Africa, certainly, the official view, of Catholics as well as Donatists, was that *traditio* was an act of apostasy. We have already referred to those admirable documents, the Passions of Felix of Thibiuca, executed for refusing to commit *traditio*, and of the martyrs of Abitina. Although a great part of the latter is an almost verbal reproduction of the official *Acta*, the Passion in the form in which we have it is the work of a Donatist, who represents the difference between the faithful and the *lapsi* as turning entirely on the question of *traditio*,[51] and does not fail to emphasize that Fundanus, bishop of Abitina, had given up his Scriptures — the most heinous form of *traditio*, needless to say. Several bishops besides Fundanus, not to mention other clerics and laymen, were guilty of *traditio*.[52] Others went in for evasions,[53] which the authorities were evidently quite willing as a rule to countenance.[54] The emphasis is always upon *traditio*. A bishop could even ask another how he could possibly have gained release after arrest 'except by giving something up or ordering it to be given up.' [55] All this concentration of interest upon *traditio*, and

[51] Passio 2; 19–23.

[52] E.g. Paul of Cirta (Optat., Append. I, pp. 186–7), Donatus of Mascula (Aug. c. Cresc. III 27.30), possibly the bishops of Zama and Furni (Optat., Append. II, p. 199). Victor of Rusiccade admitted throwing a copy of the Gospels into the flames, claiming in extenuation that it was virtually illegible (Aug. c. Cresc. III 27.30).

[53] Mensurius claimed that he had given up heretical works (Aug. Brev. Coll. III 13.25). Donatus of Calama surrendered medical books, Marinus of Aquae Tibilitanae some other papers (Aug. c. Cresc. III 27.30).

[54] See Aug. Brev. Coll. III 13.25. The obliging officials tell Mensurius to give them 'aliqua ecbola aut quodcumque.' When he refuses, they discover and take away some heretical works. Some Carthaginian decurions complain to Anullinus, but he refuses to pursue M.

[55] Aug. c. Cresc. III 27.30.

the virtual absence of any early reference to *sacrificatio* or *turificatio*, shows that the persecution in the West was carried out under E 1, and that E 4 could not have been enforced to any significant extent.[56]

There is another piece of evidence of the non-enforcement of E 4 in the West, or at any rate in the African provinces,[57] the one area for which we have much evidence. This is the entire absence of any Western reference to the purchase of immunity from sacrificing. The silence of the sources on this point presents a strong contrast to the wealth of references to the *libellatici* of the Decian persecution,[58] who procured false certificates of compliance with the imperial order. We must not, of course, expect to find any mention in the Great persecution of *libellatici* or *libelli*, for this time certificates were not issued — a question to which we shall return presently. If E 4 had really been put into operation in the West, however, the sale of immunities would certainly have taken place there, as we know it did in the East; and since the washing of dirty linen which went on after the persecution in some of the Western churches was decidedly more vigorous than in the East, and is much better evidenced, largely owing to the Donatist controversy, we should certainly have expected to hear something about the practice we are considering. It is impossible to believe that the rigorist Africans, who, in common with their Roman and Spanish brethren, had denounced this form of evasion in the 250s as a form of apostasy, would have accepted it as permissible fifty years later.

We cannot leave this question without drawing a contrast again between East and West. In the East there is conclusive evidence that Christians did buy exemption from E 4; but here it was not regarded as a sin. In his twelfth 'canon,' Peter of Alexandria de-

[56] C. Bigg (The Origins of Christianity 482–3) was inclined to doubt whether E 4 was ever published in the West. And see Jones (op. cit. in n. 41 above, 55): 'There is no sound evidence for the promulgation of the fourth edict in the West.'

[57] Byzacena (Byzacium), here treated as part of the Proconsular province, may have been a province separate from Proconsularis in 303–4, as it certainly was at some time during the first tetrarchy (ILA 3832 = CIL VIII 23179).

[58] There is evidence for *libellatici* in Spain (Cypr. Epist. LXVII 1.1; 6.1–2), at Rome (Id. XXX 3.1; also XXI 2.2; 3.2), and also of course in Africa: Id. XX 2.2; LV 3.2; 10.2; 13.2; 14.1; 17.3; 26.1; De Lapsis 27–8; Ad Fort. 11. In Epist. LV 26.1, Cyprian describes the purchase of a certificate as a far less grave sin than adultery.

clares that those who purchased immunity are not to be blamed, for they sustained loss of money with the object of saving their souls. He speaks of them almost with respect. After this we hear nothing more about the practice. Anyone who reads the canons of the Council of Ancyra with Cyprian's *De Lapsis* and letters in mind may well be astonished at the lack of any reference to the sale of immunities in the first nine canons, which deal in detail with the various grades of apostasy during the persecution. The one satisfactory explanation is that the device was not regarded as sinful by the Eastern churches, and therefore did not require to be dealt with in the disciplinary canons. All our evidence about the sale of exemptions in the Decian persecution comes from the West, whereas for the Great persecution our one piece of positive evidence (Peter's letter), with the clear negative evidence of the canons of Ancyra, comes from the East. It is surely permissible, however, to use all the evidence for both persecutions together in this respect, and to draw conclusions accordingly. In the East, we may infer, the purchase of exemptions was not regarded as sinful in either persecution. This would explain the absence of any denunciation of Eastern *libellatici* in the 250s. As regards the West, where the practice would undoubtedly have seemed as reprehensible in the Great persecution as it did fifty years earlier, we can explain the lack of any reference to the purchase of immunities only on the assumption that E 4 was little enforced, so that very few Christians (if any) would have needed to buy exemption. We shall return later to the methods of evasion of E 4, but we may note in passing that by countenancing the purchase of exemptions the Eastern churches made it possible for very many Christians to avoid the alternatives of apostasy or death without the least stain on their consciences.

So rarely does *sacrificatio* (or *turificatio*) make its appearance in the contemporary or near-contemporary documents of the African churches that it is impossible to believe E 4 could have been enforced in Africa, except perhaps in a few isolated cases. It is worth examining all the references in the earliest sources to *sacrificatio* (or *turificatio*) in the African provinces. They may be considered in three groups: —

1. (a) At the meeting of Numidian bishops at Cirta in 305,

which has already been mentioned, Donatus of Mascula evasively replied to his metropolitan's accusation of *traditio*, 'Scis quantum me quaesivit Florus ut turificarem, et non me tradidit deus in manibus eius, frater.' (b) At the Council of some seventy Donatist bishops at Carthage in (probably) 312, Marcian is reported to have declared that 'Turificati, traditores, abhorrentes deo manere in ecclesia dei non possunt, nisi (etc.).'[59] (c) Maximus, an elder of the church of Carthage, making an official accusation of *traditio* against Felix of Abthugna on the 19th August 314, twice referred (according to the surviving *procès-verbal*) to an imperial order for sacrifice as well as *traditio*.[60] The alleged *traditio* of Felix, however, was supposed to have taken place at the very beginning of the persecution under E 1, a long time before E 4 was issued, and there is not another word about sacrifice in the subsequent proceedings, which describe how E 1 was enforced at Abthugna. The references to an imperial order to sacrifice are not even consistent: in one place the Christians have to sacrifice *or* deliver their Scriptures to be burnt, in the other everyone is to sacrifice *and* give up the Scriptures. We know definitely that there had been no such imperial order at that time. Before we try to explain the three passages which have just been cited we must look at some further evidence.

2. (a) The Catholic bishop Optatus of Milevis, writing his book against the Donatists some sixty years after the persecution, speaks in one place[61] as if the Christians of Africa Proconsularis and Numidia were everywhere compelled to offer incense to the pagan gods. He also says elsewhere[62] that it was a matter of common knowledge that during the persecution some bishops were guilty of *turificatio*; and when describing the session of Numidian bishops to which reference has already been made he speaks[63] scornfully of Menalius as having stayed away from the

[59] Aug. Adv. Fulg. 26.

[60] Optat., Append. II, pp. 198–9. The form Abthugna, or Abthugni, is the best attested: see CIL VIII (Suppl. IV) 23085, and the remarks of H. Dessau at p. 2338.

[61] 3.8, a rhetorical contrast between Florus and Macarius the imperial notary sent to Africa by Constans in 347 (see W. H. C. Frend, The Donatist Church 177 ff.).

[62] II 25.

[63] I 13.

meeting, on the pretence that he was suffering from ophthalmia, to avoid being convicted of *turificatio*. (Optatus is not above calling the early Donatists collectively 'traditores, turati, homicidae,' just as Augustine after him calls them 'traditores, turificati, schismatici,'[64] and so forth; but these are merely the ordinary pleasantries of controversy between Catholics and schismatics). (b) With these passages of Optatus we may couple CIL VIII 6700 (19353), an inscription from northern Numidia, referring to an unspecified number of martyrs 'qui sunt passi sub preside Floro in civitate Milevitana in diebus turificationis.'

Now there is conclusive proof that Valerius Florus could never have enforced E 4, at any rate in northern Numidia — that part of the province which at the date of the 'Verona List' and certain inscriptions of the early fourth century was Numidia Cirtensis, and which included Milevis.[65] An inscription from Ksar el-Ahmar, the ancient Macomades, shows that Florus had been replaced as governor by Aurelius Quintianus by the time of Diocletian's *vicennalia*, which took place between 17th September and 20th November 303.[66] Quintianus is never named as a persecutor, a fact which it is hardly possible to explain on the conventional view, according to which the 'dies turificationis' followed the publication of E 4, early in 304, and represented a second stage of the Great persecution, more severe than the first stage, the 'dies traditionis.'[67] On this view, we should be obliged to suppose that the bishop of Milevis, the inscription, and even the contemporary record of the Cirta meeting are all mistaken in their references to Florus. The name of the chief persecutor, however, is surely just the very thing that is most likely to have been correctly remembered locally. The obvious explanation is that many Christians, anxious to forestall persecution, had publicly announced their apostasy, soon after the promulgation of E 1, by offering incense to the pagan gods; and that Florus, like the governors of Syria and Palestine — and doubtless many others — had attempted, possibly in accordance with official instructions

[64] Optat. I 15; Aug. Adv. Fulg. 26.

[65] See Appendix V below.

[66] ILS 644 = CIL VIII 4764 (18698). On the date of the *vicennalia* see n. 12 above.

[67] See p. 84 and n. 42 above.

from above, to induce at least some Christians to offer sacrifice or burn incense to the gods as well as hand over their books. The public defection of a bishop or two in this way might be expected to induce numbers of rank-and-file Christians to apostatize.[68]

The language used by Donatus of Mascula — 'quantum me quaesivit Florus ut turificarem' — supports the interpretation given here, for it hardly fits an official command, which would have been backed by torture (a trial Donatus did not claim to have endured) and enforced if necessary by execution. The natural interpretation of Donatus's statement is that he had yielded to a demand for *traditio* but had not given in to the suggestion of the governor that he should also offer incense.

3. We are left with only one set of sources which can be brought forward as evidence of the promulgation and enforcement of E 4 in Africa: the Passions of the African martyrs. Felix of Thibiuca and Saturninus and his companions of Abitina suffered before E 4 could have been published in Africa. Of the other Passions, the only one which is sufficiently important [69] to require serious consideration is that of Crispina of Thagora, martyred on 5th December 304 at Theveste (at this time included in the Proconsular province), after a trial before Anullinus. Four passages [70] are material for our investigation. The interrogation begins, 'Anulinus proconsul dixit: "Praecepti sacri cognovisti sententiam?" Crispina respondit: "Quid praeceptum sit nescio." Anulinus dixit: "Ut omnibus diis nostris pro salute principum sacrifices, secundum legem datam a dominis nostris Diocletiano et Maximiano piis Augustis et Constantio et Maximo [Maximiano (one MS), i.e. Galerio Maximiano] nobilissimis Caesaribus".' A little later the proconsul says, 'Caput tibi amputari praecipio, si non obtemperaveris praeceptis imperatorum dominorum nostrorum, quibus deservire cogeris subiugata: quod et omnis Africa sacrificia fecit, nec tibi dubium est.' Further on again Anullinus says, 'Sacrilega non eris si sacris obtemperes iussionibus.' Finally, the sentence pronounced on Crispina reads, 'Crispina in superstitione indigna perdurans, quae diis nostris

[68] Cf. Cypr. Epist. LIX 10.3.
[69] See, on the remainder, Appendix VI below.
[70] I 2–3; I 7; II 3; IV 1.

sacrificare noluit, secundum augustae legis mandata caelestia, gladio eam animadverti iussi.' If these passages are genuine, we shall have to admit that E 4 was promulgated in at any rate the Proconsular province, and therefore, presumably, throughout the area controlled by Maximian. No doubt most people will take this view, which seems the natural one. Some, however, may not feel entirely convinced, especially since the Passion does contain at least one flagrant insertion,[71] and the addition of a few references to sacrifice would have seemed almost *de rigueur* to any later hagiographer. It is difficult to believe that an aristocrat like Anullinus would have begun his formal written sentence with a *nominativus pendens*; and in the clause which follows, the more respectable reading, 'augustae', found in one or two manuscripts of the Passion, may well be a later attempt to improve on the 'Augusti' of the others, betraying the handiwork of a clumsy compiler. Even the proconsul's statement, 'All Africa has sacrificed, as you very well know,' does not prove the enforcement of E 4: the statement is a rhetorical exaggeration in any case, and it could just as well have been used of the large numbers of Christians who had lapsed before E 4 was issued. Moreover, as Monceaux [72] noticed, the Passion which has survived would seem to be by no means identical with the version known to Augustine.

Thus there is hardly sufficient evidence that E 4 was even promulgated in Africa, and it cannot have been enforced there, save perhaps in a few individual cases. Yet the African provinces, with those of Egypt, were regarded by Eusebius [73] as conspicuous for the number of their martyrs. In Gaul and Britain, Constantius did not even enforce E 1 properly,[74] and E 4 can never have been published in those areas. For the remainder of the West — Italy, Sicily, Spain, Raetia and Noricum — the evidence

[71] Id. III 1: 'Et adiecit Anulinus commentariensi officio dicens: "Ad omnem deformationem deducta, a novacula ablatis crinibus decalvetur, ut eius primum facies ad ignominiam deveniat."' Franchi, curiously enough, was willing to accept this; but see P. Monceaux in Mél. Boissier (1903) at p. 386. For other defects in the Passion see Monceaux, op. cit. 386–7, 388–9.

[72] Op. cit. 383–7.

[73] HE VIII 6.10.

[74] See Appendix II and n. 117 below. Alban's martyrdom cannot be dated: see C. E. Stevens in Eng. Hist. Rev. LVI (1941) at p. 373.

is very scanty indeed. It is desirable to set out what little evidence does exist.

From Sicily we have one fascinating document, the Passion of Euplus, an enthusiastic volunteer for martyrdom. Clasping a copy of the Gospels, Euplus went and shouted, 'I wish to die, for I am a Christian,' outside the office of Calvisianus, the *corrector Siciliae*. After a preliminary interrogation and some weeks' imprisonment, Euplus was brought up again before the governor, who merely ordered him to produce his 'forbidden writings' and, possibly misunderstanding his reply, ordered him to be tortured (according to the Passion) 'until he promises to sacrifice to the gods' — the only mention of sacrifice in the earliest version of the Passion. Franchi de' Cavalieri, who produced the best edition of the document,[75] may have been right in believing this to be a later insertion. However, it is quite possible that the words were actually spoken, and that they were equivalent to 'until he agrees to abandon Christianity.' This Passion, then, is easily explicable without invoking E 4. And we may go further than this. The dates on which Euplus was interrogated were 29th April and 12th August 304. If E 4 was ever promulgated in Sicily, it is hard to believe that this had not happened by April 29th, let alone August 12th; yet both interrogations of Euplus are concerned entirely with his possession of the Scriptures. It is true that Euplus was carrying a copy of the forbidden documents when he made his appearance before the governor, and of course the Passion cannot be cited as evidence against the previous publication of E 4 in Sicily; but it is worth noting that the one Passion we have for the West, outside Africa, which reproduces the official *Acta* (apart from the sentence) with hardly any alteration or embellishment should turn entirely on a provision of E 1 and relate to an insistent volunteer for martyrdom.

From Spain we have not one reliable Passion: Vincent's is a mere 'historical novel'; [76] and although that of Faustus, Januarius and Martial may go back ultimately to a respectable written

[75] Studi e testi XLIX (1928) at p. 16.

[76] See Delehaye, Les légendes hag.[3] 114. The opening words show that the compiler had no written source available.

source,[77] it is impossible to feel any confidence in its verbal accuracy; moreover, these three martyrs too are represented as volunteers, who publicly challenged the governor and proclaimed themselves Christians. Otherwise, we have nothing better than some poems in the Peristephanon of Prudentius, written about a hundred years later and having very little to do with history. From Augusta Vindelicorum in Raetia we have one document, the Passion of Afra, the 'German Magdalen,' which has been thought by some to be a substantial reproduction of the official *Acta* and by others (with more reason) to be a pure romance.[78] It seems that only one [79] among many manuscripts of this Passion contains any direct reference to an imperial command to sacrifice or otherwise suggests that Afra suffered in the Great persecution; and although the manuscript in question would appear to be the earliest, it will not inspire much confidence, except perhaps in those who are already predisposed to accept the 'Afra legend.'

From Noricum we have nothing of real value.[80] As regards Italy, from which we might have expected some evidence, we are very badly off indeed. The Roman church in particular did not preserve in a trustworthy form a record of a single one of the numerous martyrs it claims during the Great persecution: the Roman *Gesta Martyrum*, no less than twenty-three of which profess to relate to this persecution, are not earlier than the fifth century, and they are probably in the main of the late fifth and early sixth.[81] We have a number of scattered references to the

[77] Evidently Delehaye thought so, for he places the work in his third class of Passions (op. cit. 114–5).

[78] For a summary of the literature, see A. Harnack, Die Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums[3] (1915) II 281 and n. 2 ('Die Märtyrerakte taugt nichts; die Tatsache ist gut bezeugt').

[79] That edited by Vielhaber (see Appendix I below). The crucial words, apparently lacking in the other MSS, are 'necesse est ut praeceptis imperatorum obtemperes, ut accedens sacrifices.' In this MS the sentence on Afra begins with a *nominativus pendens*.

[80] The Passion of Florian of Lauriacum (on which see J. Zeiller, Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes 62–4) preserves some historical elements, but so much of it is fictitious that we cannot use it for present purposes. (Noricum ought perhaps to be considered as falling in the Eastern part of the empire during the years 303–6, and not in the area subject to Maximian).

[81] See A. Dufourcq, Étude sur les *Gesta Martyrum* romains (1900–10), esp. I 287–90. It is Delehaye's opinion also that the Roman legends 'sont dépourvues de

Roman and other Italian martyrs in fourth and fifth century writers, earlier than the Passions, and some of them — like the Passions themselves — may conceivably preserve historical material; but none of these references is of such a character that the historian can safely use it. There is no trace of any contemporary attempt to preserve records of the deeds of the Roman and Italian martyrs, and as early as the time of Pope Damasus (366–384) they were already more or less legendary figures, about whom 'traditions' circulated, based on no written documents. The Roman church failed to distinguish itself in the persecution, which left it demoralized and, until 311, continuously disorganized by violent factional strife.[82] It was actually without a bishop for more than half the seven years intervening between the death or technical apostasy [83] of Pope Marcellinus in 304 and the election of Miltiades in 311. The history of the persecution at Rome cannot be written; but there is at any rate no real evidence of the application of E 4, even if we accept the tradition that Marcellinus offered incense to the gods, for this could be explained as the result of pressure applied to Marcellinus quite apart from that edict.

The evidence for the rest of Maximian's provinces thus provides no reason for modifying the opinion arrived at on examination of the African evidence, that E 4 was hardly, if at all, enforced in Maximian's area. The only evidence of the enforcement of E 4 which commands any respect at all, apart from the Passio Crispinae, is provided by a single manuscript of the very questionable Passio Afrae.

In the West the persecution seems to have fallen into abeyance even before the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian on 1st May 305; although in Italy and Africa, and presumably Pannonia, peace did not fully return to the Church until after Severus had been overthrown, late in 306 or early in 307, by Maxentius.[84]

---

toute valeur au point de vue de l'histoire qu'elles prétendent faire connaître' (Les origines du culte des martyrs[2] 262). For the worthless Passio Sabini (Savini), which so impressed Mason and others, see also F. Lanzoni in Röm. Quartalschr. XVII (1903) 1–26, endorsed by Delehaye, Les légendes hag.[3] 83, n. 2.

[82] See the good brief summary in L. Duchesne, op. cit. (in n. 42 above) 72–6.

[83] See Appendix VII below.

[84] Eus. HE VIII 14.1; Optat. I 18. Church property was only returned to the

Eusebius [85] is substantially right in saying that in the West the persecution lasted 'not two whole years.' The last datable Western martyrdom is that of Crispina, on 5th December 304. In Numidia, where the persecution seems to have been at least as severe as anywhere in the West, it had evidently ceased for all practical purposes by February or the beginning of March 305, since clamorous meetings could then be held openly in Cirta itself, the Numidian capital, for the election of a new bishop in place of the *traditor* Paul, now deceased.[86]

4. The administration of the Fourth Edict

We must now consider the way in which E 4 was put into effect. A comparison with what we know about the administration of the persecuting edict of Decius will be helpful.

It is clear from the language used by Cyprian [87] that under the edict of Decius a particular day was appointed, whether for the whole empire or separately in each province, by which everyone had to sacrifice and obtain a certificate that he had done so. When the fatal day was past, anyone who had not sacrificed and secured his certificate would have been liable to the death penalty. Cyprian's correspondence and treatises show that the effect of the persecution was to divide the Christians into three broad classes: at one extreme the *lapsi*, who had either sacrificed or procured false certificates to that effect; at the other extreme the confessors, a few of whom were martyred; and in between the two, a substantial third group (often overlooked nowadays) which is referred to many times by Cyprian and his correspondents [88] as the *stantes*: Christians who were not arrested or called upon to make any public profession of their faith, but had at least run the risk of punishment for failing to sacrifice by the appointed

---

Christians of Rome by Maxentius in 311 (Aug. Brev. Coll. III 18.34) and to the African Christians (probably) by Constantine in 312/3 (Eus. HE X 5.15–17).

[85] MP 13.12.; cf. 13.13; HE VIII 13.11.

[86] The actual election of Silvanus, described at length in the Gesta apud Zenophilum (Optat., Append. I, pp. 192–7), must of course have taken place before the consecration-meeting on the 4th or 5th March 305: for this date, see Appendix IV below, § (d).

[87] De Lapsis 3.

[88] Cypr. De Laps. 2; 3; 4; and many letters, esp. XII 2.2; XIV 2.1; XIX 2.2; XXX 5.3; XXXI 6.2; LV 5.1.

day and might be charitably assumed to be ready to confess their faith should they be apprehended. Cyprian would have these people treated as potential confessors: he says the confessors proper had made a public and they a private confession.[89] We have no information as to what steps were taken to discover those who had no certificates, and its seems unlikely that any systematic procedure was adopted. We know from a letter of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, quoted by Eusebius,[90] that in Alexandria — and therefore, presumably, in at least some other capital cities — there was some kind of public roll-call; but this formed part of the procedure for organizing the sacrifices and was not a subsequent check.

The Decian certificates of sacrifice which have been preserved from Egypt, forty-three in number,[91] were issued by local commissioners described by some such title as *οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἠρημένοι*,[92] who were doubtless chosen by their local curiae. In every *civitas* throughout the empire the local magistrates and curia must have been saddled with the responsibility of choosing commissioners and seeing that they did their work properly; and certificates of sacrifice were no doubt provided for everywhere.

The machinery of the Great persecution was different. Two features stand out. First, certificates of sacrifice were not issued. For this we have only negative evidence: the fact that no mention is ever made of certificates in the sources, and that no certificates have survived among the papyri; but the contrast with the evidence for the Decian persecution is so striking that we can regard the complete absence of any provision for the granting of certificates as virtually certain. Secondly (and much more important), there is strong evidence that until 306 the central government did not make the municipalities responsible for taking active steps to enforce E 4. It must have been early in 306 — long after the persecution had ceased in the West — that Maximin 'for the

[89] De Laps. 3.

[90] HE VI 41.11: *ὀνομαστὶ . . . καλούμενοι.*

[91] See J. H. Knipfing, 'The Libelli of the Decian Persecution,' in Harv. Theol. Rev. XVI (1923) 345–90, supplemented by H. Grégoire, Les persécutions dans l'empire rom. (1951) 113–4, and the works there referred to.

[92] Cf. Cypr. Epist. XLIII 3.1 (Carthage) and (if the document really relates to 250) Passio Pionii III 1 (Smyrna).

first time' (τοῦτο πρῶτον) issued an edict ordering the municipal magistrates to enforce general sacrifice by men, women and children.[93] Immediately, according to the Long Recension of Eusebius's Martyrs of Palestine, heralds in every city called upon everyone to assemble at the temples, and 'the military tribunes and centurions went from house to house and from ward to ward (κατ' οἴκους καὶ ἄμφοδα), making registers of the citizens; then they summoned each one by name and thus compelled him to do what had been decreed.' (Eusebius, who is concerned only with Palestine, part of Maximin's dominions, speaks of Maximin alone as the author of this decree; but Maximin was still only a Caesar, and it seems probable that the edict was in fact issued by Galerius and Maximin jointly, in the whole of the East). Eusebius adds that throughout Caesarea (where he himself was living at the time) [94] heralds proclaimed the edict, and military tribunes summoned each individual by name from a roll. A similar edict, instructing the local magistrates to enforce universal sacrifice, was issued in 309,[95] in an even stronger form; but this time we hear nothing of the compilation of new registers.

There can be little doubt that the edict of 306 was the first of its kind during the whole persecution, and not merely during Maximin's reign. Eusebius [96] has already said that Maximin set to work on the persecution with greater vigor than his predecessors. When recording E 4, he does not mention any instructions such as he quotes Maximin as giving in 306 and 309, and the steps taken in 306 to prepare registers would not have been necessary had they been taken a year or two previously. Eusebius also speaks of the roll-calls as if they were unprecedented.

Now a decree such as E 4 could not be properly carried out, especially in districts where Christians were numerous and not unpopular, without the creation of special administrative machinery such as that which was set up in pursuance of the Decian

[93] Eus. MP 4.8.

[94] MP 4.6,8,14.

[95] By Maximin, according to Eus. MP 9.2. By now M. had probably been recognized as Augustus by Galerius, who may have prompted this action. It is obviously wrong to seek, with A. J. Mason (The Persecution of Diocletian 284–5), for echoes of this edict in Passions the wording of which is untrustworthy.

[96] MP 4.1.

edict. Until this was done, in 306, and the municipal governments were made actively responsible for enforcing E 4, the edict could only have been carried out to a very small extent. Some Christians would have been frightened into sacrificing, and some others would have been exposed and given the alternative of apostasy or death, but the *stantes* would have run even less risk of detection than in Decian times, for they were not even liable to exposure by inability to produce certificates. This is certainly what we should expect, and, as we shall see presently, it is confirmed by the narrative of the Martyrs of Palestine. It also appears that until the compilation of special registers in 306 the authorities in at least some areas (the larger towns, at any rate) may not have possessed the complete lists of inhabitants which were essential if general sacrifice was to be efficiently organized. Lists would have been available of landowners, country-dwellers, and those liable to perform liturgies, but it seems rather unlikely that the non-propertied classes in the towns would have been included in any official register.[97] If this is correct, little could have been done to enforce compliance with E 4 on the part of the urban poor, who still provided a large part of the Christian congregations. This is the situation which Maximin's drastic edict of 306 was intended to remedy: the government now proposed to compel the local authorities to act, after completing their registers. According to the Martyrs of Palestine, the government did not leave the carrying out of the new edict entirely to the municipal officials; but it is permissible to suggest that the procedure described by the Long Recension, which Eusebius witnessed with his own eyes at Caesarea, was confined to the provincial capitals and perhaps a few other important towns of the East — it would hardly have been possible to find enough troops and officers to perform these burdensome duties in more than a few cities, and in most of the *civitates* the decurions must have been left to do the work themselves. The amount of work involved throughout the East would have been considerable. The new procedure ought to have made the enforcement of the order to sacrifice much more complete. In fact, however, the evidence of the Martyrs of Palestine suggests that there was no great increase in the

[97] See Appendix VIII below.

seeking out of Christians — a fact which can only be explained by the reluctance of the provincial and civic authorities to carry out the orders given to them from above.

We have already seen that in the West, where the Church would have condemned the purchase of exemption from sacrificing as a form of lapse, E 4 was so little enforced — if at all — that resort to such evasions was unnecessary, whereas in the East the purchase of exemption did take place, but was not condemned. Those Christians who were reluctant to run the risk of arrest by becoming open confessors or secret *stantes*, and yet were unable for some reason to buy immunity from sacrificing, were often able to avoid open apostasy — but not the displeasure of the Church, and subsequent penance — by devices we are fortunately able to trace in the canons of Peter of Alexandria and the Council of Ancyra. Some Christians successfully deceived the authorities by inducing pagans to impersonate them at the ceremony of sacrificing, or by sending their own slaves (some of them Christians themselves) to sacrifice in their stead.[98] Others evaded the edict with the connivance of the authorities, extending sometimes (in the case of priests) as far as the arrangement of bogus torture-sessions, to enable them to claim they had sacrificed only after enduring extreme agony, and thus to return to the bosom of the Church on easier terms.[99] It is difficult to decide whether these collusive arrangements testify more strongly to the humanity, or to the venality, of the officials concerned. If all other resources failed, a stalwart Christian might take to flight, as many had done in the time of Decius, hoping to return when the persecution had died down. We know from Athanasius [100] that many Christians were given shelter by compassionate pagans, who hid them (at the risk of their own lives) while the persecution was at its height.

5. The evidence of Eusebius's Martyrs of Palestine

Of all the provinces of the empire, it is only Palestine — Syria Palaestina, to give it its proper title — for which we have a full list of all the martyrdoms of the Great persecution. It has some-

[98] Peter Alex. Epist. Can. 5–7 (see n. 44 above).
[99] Conc. Ancyran. I, Can. 1 (see n. 45 above).
[100] Hist. Arian. ad Monach. 64.

times been denied that Eusebius's Martyrs of Palestine gives a complete list of all the Palestinian martyrdoms of the Great persecution. The expressions Eusebius uses, however, are sufficiently clear. After describing the martyrdoms of 310 at Caesarea, the last there, he says,[101] *καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ Καισάρειαν ἐφ' ὅλοις τοῖς τοῦ διωγμοῦ χρόνοις ἐπιτελεσθέντα μαρτύρια τοιαῦτα.* And at the very end of his narrative, after mentioning the later mass execution at Phaeno, he adds,[102] *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τὰ κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἐν ὅλοις ἔτεσιν ὀκτὼ συμπεπερανθέντα μαρτύρια.* Eusebius evidently believed he had mentioned all the Palestinian martyrdoms, and there is no reason to think his list is incomplete. Eusebius was a priest of the church of Caesarea, the capital of the province, and he probably remained in Palestine, if not at Caesarea itself, during most of the years in question. Few Palestinian martyrdoms (except of course those at Phaeno) could have taken place elsewhere than at Caesarea, for sentence of death could be pronounced only by the provincial governor, who would spend most of his time in his capital city, and execution was public and normally followed immediately after sentence. If the governor condemned a Christian when holding his periodic assize in some city other than the provincial capital, the proceedings would receive full publicity, and it would have been easy for Eusebius to obtain particulars. There are no grounds for supposing that any Palestinian martyrdoms failed to come to Eusebius's notice.

Eusebius's Palestinian[103] martyrs can profitably be divided, for purposes of analysis, into three classes: first, volunteers, who actively brought arrest and death upon themselves; secondly, those who, without going so far as to demand martyrdom, nevertheless attracted attention to themselves;[104] and thirdly, those whose arrest was *not certainly* due to their own act and who *may* have been sought out by the authorities. The results of classification on these lines are astonishing. Out of a total of ninety-one martyrs, we must set aside forty-four who were executed at Phaeno in the last years of the persecution: we have no details

[101] MP 11.31.

[102] 13.11 *S* (cf. *L*).

[103] In the special sense in which Eus. uses the term, to include Palestinians, wherever they suffered, and Christians from other provinces martyred in Palestine.

[104] Cf. Peter Alex. Epist. Can. 11.

of the circumstances in which they were arrested, and at least two-thirds of them must have been Egyptians.[105] Of the remaining forty-seven, at least thirteen were volunteers, and at least eighteen drew attention to themselves, leaving *at most* sixteen who may have been sought out. Small as this last group is, it contains at least three who acted most contumaciously at their trial.[106] For the fourteen who suffered before the abdication of Diocletian, the corresponding figures (even more striking) are eight, two and four.

It is necessary to be very circumspect in drawing conclusions from these figures. They emphatically do not prove that the persecution in Palestine was a trivial affair or that it did not cause the Christian community great anxiety and misery. Some condemned Christians (whose numbers, by the way, are to be reckoned in dozens or scores rather than hundreds) [107] were sent to the mines at Phaeno, and some intrepid confessors, like the Donatus to whom Lactantius addressed his De Mortibus Persecutorum,[108] are known to have spent months and even years in prison, some of them sustaining repeated interrogations under torture. Some of those who apostatized in fear or under pressure may have suffered great agony of mind. Mere statistics of martyrdoms are not at all a reliable index of the sufferings of the Christians as a whole. Nevertheless, one certain conclusion does impose itself. Of the martyrs of Palestine about whom we have any detailed information, very few had been *sought out*: approximately twice as many (if not more) were volunteers or had otherwise attracted the attention of the authorities. No such definite

[105] Including 5 out of the 6 whose names we know. In MP 13.1 *L*, Eus. gives over 100 Egyptians out of a total of about 150 Christians remaining at Phaeno. Cf. 13.6 *S*. He records no great number of Palestinian confessors as being condemned to the mines: cf. MP 7.2,3; 8.3,4; 13.1 *L*; 13.10 *L*. In MP 8.1,13 he mentions 227 Egyptian Christians sent to Palestine in two groups: the first batch (of 97: MP 8.1 *L*, against *S*) were all sent to Phaeno; of the second (numbering 130: MP 8.13), some were taken to Cilicia.

[106] Procopius, Zacchaeus, and the woman of Gaza (Ennatha: Eus. MP 8.8 *L*). The other members of this third group are Timothy, Thecla (whose execution is not actually recorded — perhaps she died in prison), Ulpian, Agapius I (MP 3.1; 6.3–7), Domninus, Auxentius, the two Pauls, Ennathas, Peter, Asclepius, Pamphilus and Valens. The 13 outright volunteers are Alpheus, Romanus, the 6 young men of Eus. MP 3.3–4, Apphianus, Aedesius, Antoninus, Zebinas and Germanus.

[107] See n. 105 above.

[108] 16.3–11; 35.2.

conclusion can be reached in respect of the other provinces of the empire. However, since Eusebius represents the two men who governed Palestine during almost all the years of persecution — Urban (304–308/9) and Firmilian (308/9–310) — as particularly enthusiastic and cruel persecutors, and the same historian depicts Maximin as the most zealous in this regard of all the emperors, it seems very possible that the extent to which Christians were sought out was at least no greater in most of the other provinces. The number of martyrs may well have been exceptionally great in Egypt — but it is precisely in Egypt that we should have expected to find the highest proportion of volunteers among the martyrs; and indeed it is certain that voluntary martyrdom was extensively practised by the Egyptians, of the Thebaid at any rate, for when Eusebius describes his experiences there, he makes it clear that the 'many' Christians he himself saw condemned to death 'in a single day' were in fact volunteers, who 'leapt up before the judgment seat from this side and that (ἐπεπήδων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι), and confessed themselves to be Christians,' receiving sentence with hymns of thanksgiving.[109]

According to a statement of Lactantius,[110] some governors boasted of having shed no Christian blood. Others, like Anullinus, who winked at Mensurius's evasion of E 1,[111] performed their duties without unnecessary enthusiasm. The whole climate of opinion had changed since the mid-third century, when the persecution of Decius had been preceded by serious anti-Christian rioting at Alexandria.[112] Spontaneous popular hostility to Christianity seems to have virtually ceased by the end of the third century. It is therefore not surprising that the edicts enjoining general sacrifice, despite pressure from above, were enforced in

[109] HE VIII 9.5. On Id. 3 we should note the sceptical observations of Gibbon (ed. Bury, II 137, n. 183). And here also the martyrs may well have been mainly volunteers. For five Egyptian volunteers in the Decian persecution, see Eus. HE VI 41.22–23. For the militant characteristics of lower class Egyptians in the later 4th century, see Amm. Marc. XXII 16.23.

[110] Div. Inst. V 11.13. Lact. characteristically contrives to make his statement redound to the discredit of the governors concerned.

[111] See n. 54 above.

[112] Dionys. Alex., ap. Eus. HE VI 41.1–9; cf. Firmilian, ap. Cypr. Epist. LXXV 10.1. Contrast Eus. MP 9.3.

a very lax manner. In the hagiographers, as Delehaye [113] put it, 'c'est toujours et partout la chasse aux chrétiens de tout rang.' That picture could hardly be more misleading.

* * *

We may reasonably conclude that except on isolated occasions, as for example during the brief but intense local persecution at Nicomedia soon after the issue of E 1,[114] and perhaps a massacre of the whole population — or at any rate the whole Christian congregation — of a Phrygian town,[115] the ordinary Christian who did not insist on openly parading his confession of faith (the *stans*) was most unlikely to become a victim of the persecution at all, especially in the years before the municipal authorities of the East were made responsible for the active enforcement of E 4. And in the West, where the persecution ceased before it had properly developed, we need not be surprised to find very few martyrdoms indeed, except of volunteers or of those who defied E 1. The so-called Great persecution has been exaggerated in Christian tradition to an extent which even Gibbon did not fully appreciate. Other persecutions of Christianity were sporadic and short-lived, and none of them, except those of Decius and perhaps Valerian, were general, involving the whole or even the greater part of the empire. No estimate of the total number of martyrs can profitably be attempted, but the considerations brought forward here certainly reinforce the arguments of those who have maintained that in the Great persecution, at any rate, the number was not large.

But when all this is said, we must beware of underestimating the great suffering caused to the Christians by the atmosphere of hostility, liable to turn at any moment into active persecution, in which the Church grew up and ultimately triumphed. The threat of persecution, always hanging over their heads, was a factor of

[113] Les passions des martyrs 241; cf. the quotation on p. 244 from the Passion of Trophimus and others.

[114] Eus. HE VIII 6.1–7; Lact. MP 15.1–3.

[115] Contrast Lact. Div. Inst. V 11.10 with Eus. HE VIII 11.1 (and Rufinus's version). This may be exaggerated hearsay: not even the name of the town is given. Ramsay's suggestion (Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia I ii, 505–9) that the town was Eumeneia is mere conjecture.

the utmost importance in the environment of the early Christians. And for some of the deplorable features which we find in the mentality of so many of the prominent churchmen and ecclesiastical writers of the fourth and following centuries — above all the readiness to persecute and the hysterical denunciation of theological opponents — the atmosphere of constant menace in which Christianity had matured was in some degree responsible.

APPENDICES

I: The Passions. The bibliography by Baynes in Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 790–3 gives full references to the best texts of most of the Passions cited here, with the principal recent discussions. The remaining Passions, except that of Florian (for which see n. 80 above), will be found in R. Knopf, Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten [3] (ed. G. Krüger, 1929), or the various editions (1690–1859) of Th. Ruinart, Acta Martyrum. The doubtful Passio Afrae is edited by B. Krusch in Mon. Germ. Hist., Scr. rer. Merov. III 61–4 (cf. 41–54), and a single MS by G. Vielhaber in Anal. Bolland. XXVI (1907) 59–61 (cf. 58, 61–5).

II: The divisions of the Empire (see n. 16 above). It used to be generally assumed that there was a more or less complete territorial division of the empire among the four emperors of the first tetrarchy, 293–305 (cf. Lact. MP 7.2: 'in quattuor partes orbe diviso'), and that the government of any particular area at any given time was primarily in the hands of the Augustus or Caesar who was then supposedly in charge of that area. Quite recently Seston (op. cit. in n. 12 above, 231–47) has shown that this conception cannot be right: the Roman world still remained in principle an 'indivisum patrimonium,' the term used by a panegyrist (Paneg. Lat. III (XI) 6) a few years earlier during the 'dyarchy' of Diocletian and Maximian. It is perhaps worth adding that '*quadri*partito imperio,' in F. Pichlmayr's standard text of Aurelius Victor (Caes. XXXIX 30) is an implausible interpretation of the contractions in the MSS (q̲u̲i and qī): A. Schott's '*quasi* partito imperio' is distinctly more acceptable. Seston, however, goes too far when he says (op. cit. 243) that 'la division de l'empire en quatre parts ne concerna que les revenus de la capitation et de l'annone affectés à chaque empereur pour ses troupes; elle ne toucha pas l'administration proprement dite qui resta une.' Even if this is a substantially correct statement of the pure theory of Diocletian's tetrarchy, it gives a misleading impression of its practice. It is evident from the diatribe against Maximian

in the De Mortibus Persecutorum (8.3–4), rhetorical and exaggerated as it is, that Lactantius conceived M. as pursuing, in a particular area, a definite policy of his own choice, which, even if its motives were financial, went far beyond the purely financial sphere. This must be correct: M. was unable to make new laws in the West without obtaining the approval of D.; but subject always to the overriding control of the 'senior Augustus,' whose personal *auctoritas* was supreme,[116] he must have had a considerable degree of freedom in the way he enforced the existing laws, in every sphere, in the West. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Constantius, who was only M.'s Caesar, evidently had in practice a more or less free hand in the administration of Gaul and Britain, where he spent all his time. M., as far as we know, never entered C.'s area after 293, except to guard the Rhine frontier while C. was reconquering Britain, but remained in Italy, Africa and Spain, which C. never visited again. We know[117] that C. did not even enforce E 1 properly, contenting himself with the perfunctory demolition of churches. This nicely illustrates the position of C. (and indirectly, that of M.) in theory and in practice: the edict had to be promulgated, and in theory it had to be enforced, but in practice C. could and did prevent its having much effect.

Unfortunately, we seem to have no reliable evidence about the position of Galerius. It is usually believed that he was allotted a distinct territorial sphere of authority, in the Balkans; but this is by no means certain, or even probable. D. and his Caesar did not, like their colleagues in the West, spend all their time in separate areas. G., for instance, warred against the Persians in 297/8 from Syria, where D. was also present, and he passed the whole winter of 302/3 and part of the spring of 305 with D. at Nicomedia. D. was in the Danube provinces and Thrace throughout 293 and all but the last few weeks of 294, spending much of his time at Sirmium in Pannonia; in the summer of 303 he was on the lower Danube again, and after a visit to Italy for his *vicennalia* towards the end of 303 he spent the spring and summer of 304 in the Balkans.[118] There may well have been other such journeys.

[116] See esp. Lact. MP 15.6; Julian Orat. I 7ab. Cf. also Eus. HE VIII 13.11; MP 3.5; Vita Const. I 14; II 51.

[117] The best evidence is the Donatist petition in Optat. I 22. Against the disingenuous Eus. HE VIII 13.12–13 and VIII Append. 4, and the absurd Vita Const. I 16, we must obviously accept Lact. MP 15.7.

[118] The details can be reconstructed from Lact. MP 10.6; 11.3; 14; 17–19 and the *subscriptiones* of the constitutions issued during the years 293–4 and 303: see the list of constitutions in chronological order in P. Krüger's edn. of the Cod. Just., Appendix I, and Mommsen, Ges. Schr. II ii, at pp. 273–88, 290. Lact. MP 18.6 is very exaggerated.

Again, if G. had really been the ruler of the Balkan area, we might have expected to find him given a pre-eminent position in the reliefs on his triumphal arch at Thessalonica (for which see K. F. Kinch, L'arc de triomphe de Salonique, esp. pl. v–vi and pp. 24–6, 34–7); but it seems that in fact he is there subordinated to D., except when he is represented as the victorious general of the Persian war (see Seston, op. cit. 180–3, 250–2). It is significant that an independent policy *in a particular area* in regard to the persecution seems never to be attributed to G. by any writer, even Lact. and Eus., who considered G. as the instigator of the whole affair; and Lact. represents G. as gaining his end solely by working upon and through D.

Only two fourth century writers profess to state G.'s share in a division of the empire. Aurelius Victor (Caes. XXXIX 30), who gives him 'Illyrici ora adusque Ponti fretum,' was probably influenced in his allocation of all four areas, as Seston [119] has pointed out, by his knowledge of the regional praetorian prefectures of the time at which he himself was writing. Praxagoras of Athens (FGrH 219 F 1.1), who allows G. Greece, Macedon, ἡ κάτω Ἀσία and Thrace, gives an incomplete account of the division, actually ignoring Syria, Africa, Spain, Gaul and the greater part of the Balkans. Eutropius, on the other hand, although he describes (X 1) the partition of the Roman world between Constantius and Galerius in 305, says nothing about a territorial division among the members of Diocletian's tetrarchy. And Eusebius (HE VIII 13.11; MP 13.13) describes as quite unprecedented the pursuit of two entirely different policies in regard to the Christians in the East and in the West, from the abdication of D. and M., or rather, from shortly before that event (οὔπω in HE VIII 13.11), when D. was ailing.

All this suggests that contemporaries recognized in the second tetrarchy a division of authority which had not existed in the first. The facts certainly support this view. The unity of the first tetrarchy had been preserved mainly by the *auctoritas* of D.; the second tetrarchy, having no such cohesive principle, soon resolved itself into distinct territorial principalities. Although in theory the pretence of unity was maintained, yet immediately upon the abdication of D. and M. there seems to have been a fairly clear territorial division between Constantius and his Caesar Severus in the West (who took between them roughly the Latin-speaking half of the empire, including Pannonia), and Galerius and his Caesar Maximin in the East. There was even a well-marked

[119] Op. cit. (in n. 12 above) 244–5, citing the proof by J. R. Palanque (Essai sur la préfecture du prétoire du Bas-Emp. 34) of the existence of a separate Prefecture of Illyricum from 357 to c. 361.

division between the Augustus and the Caesar in each area, C. leaving Italy and Africa to Severus, and G. similarly leaving to M. the vast diocese of Oriens, stretching from the Taurus to the Great Syrtis.

III: The issue of E 4 (see n. 16 above). The number of martyrdoms in this period in the whole empire to which dates can be assigned with any confidence is very small indeed. From Asia Minor, where Christianity was as strong as anywhere, there are no such martyrdoms at all. It does seem quite probable, however, that enforcement of E 4 first began in the Balkan area (see n. 16 above). On this probability, and the assumption (which we have seen to be not well founded) that the administration of the Balkans had been entrusted to Galerius to the same extent as that of Italy, Spain and Africa to Maximian and that of Gaul and Britain to Constantius, a bold theory has been developed about the origin of E 4 (Baynes, op. cit. in n. 16 above, 193, and in Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 667–8). That edict is conceived as having been issued by G. on his own responsibility, in February 304, while D. was incapacitated, and put into operation in the Balkans, then forced on M. with the threat of civil war, and finally adopted with reluctance by D. in the East in 305.

This theory has little to commend it. The hazards of communication in those days might result in long delays before an edict was promulgated everywhere. A glance at the *subscriptiones* of some of the constitutions in the Codes will reveal unaccountable variations in this respect. To quote only one well attested early example, five and a half months elapsed before three laws issued at Trier early in November, 313 (CTh IX 40.1; XI 30.2; 36.1), were received at Hadrumetum by the governor of Byzacena. Thus the earlier appearance of E 4 in the Balkans could be explained quite simply by the fact that the edict reached these provinces earlier than many other areas, because it was issued there, or nearby. D. was at Ravenna on January 1st, 304; his next move — after how long an interval, we do not know — was into the Balkan district (Lact. MP 17.3–4). G. may well have been in the Balkans too at this time; but if indeed E 4 was more widely enforced, in the spring of 304, in this area than elsewhere — and the evidence (see n. 16 above) provides no very sure basis for the assumption — the most probable explanation would be the presence of D. himself. There is no reason to conceive D. as very seriously ill in the early part of 304: he would hardly have spent the summer travelling along the Danube shore (Lact. MP 17.3–4: 'lectica plurimum vehebatur'; cf. 'morbum levem') if he had been so ill as to be incapable of exercising control of affairs; and in the autumn of 304 he was able to appear in public and

dedicate his new circus at Nicomedia (Lact. MP 17.4; and note the date of CJ III 28.26). Lact. (MP 17.8), mentioning D.'s next public appearance, on 1st March 305, when he was convalescent and 'scarcely recognizable,' adds, 'quippe qui anno fere toto aegritudine tabuisset,' where *fere*, taken with *toto*, must mean 'nearly' rather than 'about' a year. This too accords badly with the picture of a D. gravely ill in the very first weeks of 304.

The testimony of the sources, such as they are, is certainly in favor of the view that G. was a particularly bitter enemy of the Christians and the chief instigator of the persecution: both Lact. (MP 10.6; 11), who was at Nicomedia in 303, and Eusebius (HE VIII 16.2 and Appendix 1,4; Vita Const. I 56–8) evidently believed this. On the other hand, the emperor Constantine (ap. Eus. VC II 51), claiming first-hand knowledge, seems to have attributed the persecution (the 'sanguinary edicts') mainly to the personal superstition of D.; he ignores G. Moreover, the author of the Oratio ad Sanctos (whether Constantine or some contemporary),[120] apostrophizing recent persecutors of the Church, from Decius onwards, addresses himself to D. alone among the tetrarchs: this is all the more significant, in that the point of the whole passage (ch. 24–5) is that persecutors come to a bad end, and G.'s end was notoriously gruesome, whereas D.'s was not. One may think that G.'s painful death would in any event have tended to lead to his being represented in Christian propaganda as the inspirer of the persecution. And it is perhaps worth noticing that Eutropius (Brev. IX 26) credits D. with being clever at making others bear the odium for his own severities.

We may conclude, then, that D. undertook the persecution partly at least for superstitious reasons of his own, although pressure exerted upon him by G. may well have been an important factor, perhaps even decisive. To attribute E 4 entirely to the initiative of G. is to go far beyond the evidence. Lact., for all his anxiety to represent the persecution as the constant preoccupation of G., never even hints that his object in threatening M. with war was to make him join in the persecution: he speaks of G. as intent at this time solely on driving both Augusti to resign, so that he himself could attain supreme power (MP 18.1–7).

We may well ask how the remarkably intelligent Diocletian could have allowed himself to be persuaded to undertake a more extreme policy which events later showed to be seriously mistaken. The answer is perhaps that E 1 (especially in the East, where the Church did not regard *traditio* as a sin) may easily have appeared to the government to have

[120] See Baynes, Constantine the Great and the Christian Church (Proc. Br. Acad. XV, 1929) 50–6.

been highly successful, and that little resistance may have been anticipated to E 4.

IV: Executions under E 1 (see n. 21 above). (a) Felix, bishop of Thibiuca, according to his Passion, was executed at Carthage for refusing to commit *traditio*, on 15th July 303. (b) Saturninus and his companions of Abitina were tried at Carthage on 12th February 304 (Aug. Brev. Coll. III 17.32) for holding a religious service, before E 4 could have been promulgated in Africa: see their Passion. These Christians were done to death in one way or another, by starvation if not by the sword. (c) Secundus, bishop of Tigisis in Numidia during the persecution, wrote in 304 or 305 of Numidian Christians martyred for refusing to hand over the Scriptures (Aug. Brev. Coll. III 13.25; 15.27). (d) At the meeting of Numidian bishops at Carthage on 4th or 5th March 305 (on the date, see O. Seeck in Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. X, 1889, 526–7), the same Secundus said of the matryrs, 'quia non tradiderunt, ideo et coronati sunt' (Aug. c. Cresc. III 27.30). (e) CIL VIII 6700 (19353), referring to the martyrs of Milevis, must also relate to executions previous to E 4 and therefore under E 1: see p. 90 above.

V: The divisions of Numidia (see n. 65 above). Inscriptions attest the governorship of Florus in the North, centre, and extreme South-West of Numidia: CIL VIII 6700, 19353 (Milevis); 4324 (Casae); 2345–7 = ILS 631–3 (Thamugadi); Ann. ép., 1942–3, 81 (the South-West). Only the Thamugadi inscriptions refer to Florus as governor of 'N.M' (see G. Goyau in Mél. d'arch. et d'hist. XIII, 1893, 251–79, with plate opp. p. 255), i.e., presumably, the 'Numidia Militiana' of the Verona List. Seston (op. cit. in n. 12 above, 326–30) believes that F. first governed Numidia as a whole, and then an enlarged Numidia Militiana which now included Tripolitania; but if so, why is Quintianus, in the inscription mentioned in n. 66 above, said to be governing 'p(rovinciam) N(umidiam),' and not 'N(umidiam) C(irtensem)'? A 'N(umidia) C(irtensis)' is attested in 306: ILS 651 = CIL VIII 5526 (18860); 7965. Some problems remain, but Macomades, the site of Quintianus's inscription, must have been included in the Northern rather than the Southern subdivision of Numidia, and there can be no doubt at all that Florus had left Northern Numidia before the *vicennalia*.

VI: The African Passions (see n. 69 above). On the African Passions see P. Monceaux, Hist. litt. de l'Afrique chrét. III (1905) 122–61. Nothing need be said here of Restituta (Id. 133–4), Innocentius (Id. 134–5), the Twelve Brothers of Hadrumetum (Id. 135–6), Arcadius (Id. 154–6), or Marciana (Id. 156–8): their Passions are of no value for present purposes. The 'martyr' Salsa (Id. 163–8) has been shown

to be imaginary by H. Grégoire, in Byzantion XII (1937) 213–24. Aug. Serm. CCCXXVI 2 purports to quote the dialogue between a governor and certain martyrs (perhaps the 'Twenty Martyrs' of Numidia, on whom see Monceaux, op. cit. 153) who are ordered to sacrifice and refuse. This may be based on the official Acta, but the governor's convenient question, 'Quam ergo auctoritatem potestis habere?' (inviting the reply, 'Auctoritatem regis aeterni portamus'), does not sound genuine. And in any event, as we have no more than a small fragment of the interrogation we cannot safely conclude that we have here an example of the enforcement of E 4, rather than, for instance, the trial of Christians arrested, as so often in Africa, for disobeying E 1. By Augustine's day, of course, refusal to sacrifice was already a stock formula.

The curious Passion of Typasius the veteran (Monceaux, op. cit. 27, 126–32), from Mauretania Caesariensis, declares that Maximian 'edictum per Africam misit, ut demolirentur ecclesiae, incenderentur divinae legis codices, turificarent sacerdotes et populi, atque omnes revocarentur ad militiam veterani' (§ 4); the officer who brings T. before the *dux* accuses him of declining to sacrifice to the gods 'sicut praeceptum est' (§ 5); and there are other references to sacrificing. But the main offence committed by T. is refusal to obey a recall to the colors, and the question of sacrifice is incidental. The Passion of Fabius (Monceaux, op. cit. 27, 122–6), who was martyred for refusing to carry a standard in the governor's procession, also comes from Mauretania Caesariensis. We are told (§ 2) that one of the tetrarchs 'qui Orientis partibus praesidebat, mittit ad socios suos per diabolum scripta feralia, ut beatum Fabium a Christianorum castris ad turificationis nefas compellerent;' but after this we hear no more about offering incense or sacrificing. Monceaux has shown that there is no reason to date either of these Mauretanian martyrdoms during the Great persecution.

Monceaux's conclusion (op. cit. 30) is that the only North African Christians certainly martyred for refusing to sacrifice (i.e., under E 4) are Crispina, the martyrs of Milevis (p. 90 above), and Maxima, Donatilla and Secunda. The Passion of these three women (on which see Monceaux, op. cit. 148–51; Delehaye in Anal. Bolland. LIV, 1936, 296–300) may contain historical elements, but it does not deserve the respect it has received from most commentators: it has suffered extensive interpolations and revisions, and its wording cannot at any point be trusted. This is apparent from the ludicrously unhistorical opening sentence, 'In illis diebus Maximianus et Gallienus imperatores litteras miserunt per omnem illam provinciam ut Christiani sacrificarent in

possessione Cephalitana'; from the proconsul's questions, 'Christiani estis an pagani?', 'Christiana es an pagana?'; from the double sentence pronounced on the women; and similar absurdities (Passio 1; 3; 6). The Passion provides no good evidence that the condemnation was in fact under E 4.

VII: Pope Marcellinus (see n. 83 above). Marcellinus was evidently guilty of some act which was regarded at the time, or shortly afterwards, as discreditable: he is accused in the sources of *traditio* of the Scriptures,[121] or of *turificatio*,[122] or of both these crimes; [123] and the legends of his subsequent repentance and martydom [124] are most unconvincing. In the light of what has been said above, it may be suggested that perhaps M. in fact committed *traditio*, before the rigorist African view that such an act was tantamount to apostasy came to prevail generally in the Western churches, and that the memory of this was kept alive, especially by the Donatist group at Rome, and exaggerated in the customary manner to include *turificatio*. At any rate, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion of Duchesne (op. cit. in n. 42 above, 74) that 'something unpleasant must have happened.' M. evidently suffered some sort of *damnatio memoriae*: see T. G. Jalland, The Church and the Papacy 185–6 (where Diocletian's *vicennalia*, however, are dated a year too late).

VIII: What registers were available for enforcing E 4? (see n. 97 above). We do not know for certain what personal registers were kept, even in Egypt, but it is hard to believe that any such lists would have been compiled for other than fiscal purposes — i.e., in connection with anything except taxes or liturgies.

As a result of Diocletian's reorganization of the taxation system, comprehensive registers should have been available of all landowners and agricultural workers: P. Cairo Boak 1, the edict (dated 297) of the prefect of Egypt, Aristius Optatus, speaks specifically of ἄγροικοι only. A. Déléage, La capitation du Bas-Empire 49, lists the returns made

[121] Aug. c. Litt. Petil. II 92.202; cf. Gesta Coll. Carth. III 491–514; Aug. Brev. Coll. III 18.34–36.

[122] Liber Pontif., ed. Duchesne, I 162–3; cf. 72–3; Acta ps.-Synod. Sinuessae, in Mansi I 1249–60 (cf. Hefele-Leclercq, Hist. des conciles I i, 207–8).

[123] Aug. De Unic. Bapt. 16.27, 30; Liber Genealogus 626 (ed. Mommsen, in MGH Auct. Antiq. IX, Chron. Min. i. 196). On the Donatist additions to this work, see Monceaux, op. cit. (in Appendix VI above) IV 101–2.

[124] Liber Pontif. and Acta ps.-Synod. Sinuess. (as cited in n. 122 above); cf. Theodoret Hist. Eccles. I 2. The silence of the Catalogus Liberianus (Duchesne, Liber Pontif. I 6–7), Depositio Episcoporum (Id. 10: here 'Marcellini' should clearly be 'Marcelli'), and Depositio Martyrum (Id. 11–12), as well as of the Martyrologium Hieronymianum, seems conclusive.

under this edict; add P. Ryl. IV 656. However, until the introduction of the *collatio lustralis*, or χρυσάργυρον, probably by Constantine, there seems to be no good evidence that the urban poor paid direct taxation anywhere in the empire in the early fourth century, except in the dioceses directly subject to Galerius (or some of them) in the years c. 306 to 311: see Lact. MP 23; 26.2; and CTh XIII 10.2, dated 311 by O. Seeck, Regesten d. Kaiser u. Päpste 52–3. In Julian's reign the townsfolk of Caesarea in Cappadocia were free from taxes imposed on the villagers (Sozom. HE V 4). Even if P. Cairo Boak 12 and P. Strasb. 42 (= W. Chrest. 210) are returns made for the purpose of a capitation tax, as believed by Déléage (op. cit. 44–6), the tax in question was probably limited to the agricultural population, as Déléage realized (op. cit. 46). Similarly, the ἀνδρισμός of P. Ryl. IV 658, line 8, is simply the Diocletianic *capitatio* (ἀρουρηδὸς καὶ ἀνδρισμός = *jugatio et capitatio*). The evidence for a poll-tax discussed by H. I. Bell in his Introduction (pp. 167–73) to P. Lond. IV 1419 is for a later period. The ἐπικεφάλαιον πόλεως of Oxyrhynchus, evidenced only from 301 to 315, is puzzling, but whether it is to be explained as by Déléage (op. cit. 46–48), or as by A. C. Johnson and L. C. West, Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies 259–61 (and see 265–8), or in some other way, it does not establish the existence of a general poll-tax payable by the urban population. Even in Egypt the original poll-tax (λαογραφία) had died out during the first half of the third century (see H. I. Bell in J. Rom. Stud. XXXVII, 1947, 17–23), and the poll-tax of Syria and other provinces must also have ceased to be exacted at the latest during the severe inflation of the 260s, in the reign of Gallienus.

Some lists have been preserved on papyrus which may well contain the names of those liable to liturgies: P. Oslo III 111 (in which only males appear) is a good example. In some cases all but the poorest citizens may have been included — but it was probably still among this class that the highest proportion of Christians was to be found in the early years of the fourth century. It would be very rash to dogmatize, especially since Déléage (op. cit.) has shown how wrong it is to generalize from particular areas; but the procedure described by Eus. MP 4.8 is inexplicable if the authorities already possessed proper registers.

MARK II, 10a AND THE INTERPRETATION OF THE HEALING OF THE PARALYTIC

G. H. BOOBYER
University of Durham (Newcastle Division)
Newcastle upon Tyne, England

The main exegetical difficulties of Mk. II, 1–12 are considered to be: (a) the awkwardness of the wording of 10b and 11a. With the statement "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins" Jesus is held to be addressing the scribes, but the text proceeds with an abrupt transition to "he saith to the sick of the palsy, I say unto thee. . . ." (b) The public use of the title "Son of man" so early in the Lord's ministry. (c) The open avowal to the scribes of the Son of man's power on earth to forgive sins. (d) The observation in verse 12 that "they were all amazed and glorified God," as though even the critical scribes joined with the crowd in the approving acclamation.

Most commentators hold that these features of the narrative signify that in its present form it has undergone interpretative or apologetic additions; and it is a common view that 5b–10 is a secondary insertion by which a miracle story about the healing of a paralytic was expanded to include a claim by Jesus to forgive sins. 5b–10 might then be historical tradition which originally existed apart from the present context, as V. Taylor maintains; [1] or it could have been a creation of the early church, fashioned for the purpose of affirming the authority of Jesus Christ to forgive sins, as scholars like Loisy [2] and R. Bultmann [3] have argued.

But does this suggestion really do much to account for the text of the pericope as it now stands in St. Mark? In point of fact, it leaves the chief problems unanswered. The clumsy wording of II, 10 and 11 must still be explained. Was Mark responsible for it? Or, if the present, composite structure was made before Mark wrote, is the evangelist as well as earlier users of the tradition

[1] From Tradition to Gospel (1933), pp. 66–68; The Gospel according to St. Mark (1952), p. 191.
[2] L'Évangile selon Marc (1912), 87–89.
[3] Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (1931), pp. 12–14.

likely to have been content with it. It may be doubted. And what of the claim of the Son of man in II, 10a to forgive sins, a claim made without reserve before the scribes? This is the biggest difficulty of the section; and even if 5b–10 is a secondary expansion of the narrative, it must still be asked how such words as those in II, 10a could come to have a place in an originally independent 5b–10, whether these verses represent historical tradition or were an apologetic creation of the primitive, christian church. On either view, II, 10a is not easy to understand.

If 5b–10 is regarded as genuine tradition, the query at once arises whether the Lord really did affirm in the presence of the scribes (and presumably during the Galilean ministry) his messianic status and function — that he was Son of man with power on earth to forgive sins. The idea would be in conflict with the general probabilities and with the main testimony of the Marcan tradition.

This difficulty is not adequately met by such suggestions as that "Son of man" was not a widely recognized, messianic title and so will not have been understood as such by the scribes; or that "Son of man" could in any case have been readily taken in the non-messianic, Old-Testament sense of "man," because, as A. E. J. Rawlinson rightly observed, "The difficulty lies not in the mere fact of the use of the title Son of Man, but in the open and explicit avowal, in the presence of his enemies and in terms which could hardly be misunderstood, of the claim to exercise upon earth a divine prerogative." [4] The forgiveness of sins in Old-Testament thought was God's right. If Jesus claimed it, then he must have been inwardly aware that he was entitled to speak and act as God's special representative in dealing with sin. This assurance of an authority to forgive sins was in that case an integral part of his own messianic consciousness. It belonged to the meaning of the messianic office as he interpreted it, although Jewish belief in general seems not to have expected the Messiah to forgive sins. Therefore, in unreservedly proclaiming his authority on earth to forgive sins, he was publicly disclosing to the scribes his messianic mission as he understood it, whatever meaning the scribes may have attached to the designation "Son of man." But even scholars

[4] The Gospel according to St. Mark (1925), p. 24.

who defend the historicity of 5b–10 recognize that so early a public revelation of messiahship was improbable.[5] The argument seems to point to the conclusion that though 5b–9 could well be reliable, historical tradition, II, 10a was not spoken by Jesus to the scribes.

But is II, 10a more intelligible on the view that II, 5–10 is a compilation of the apostolic community? Might it at least have been placed upon the lips of Jesus as a saying to the scribes? This theory, however, must reckon with the fact that for members of the early church the whole of 10a, including the title "Son of man," was unquestionably an explicit affirmation of the Lord's messianic rank. For Mark and in pre-Marcan tradition the Son of man was the supernatural Jesus Christ — Son of man and Son of God; and that Jesus as the Christ brought forgiveness of sins was a leading theme of the church's gospel. Old-Testament passages, too, speaking of a coming forgiveness of sins will have been treated messianically, and held to be receiving their fulfilment in the forgiveness of sins by Jesus.[6]

Is one, therefore, to understand that the pre-Marcan or the Marcan conception of the course of the ministry of Jesus was such that believers in apostolic times could readily have invented a logion which made the Lord publicly assert his divine nature and authority before the scribes during the period of his Galilean activity? Those who affirm it ought surely to be prepared to argue that the Johannine presentation of the revelation of the Messiahship was more likely to have been familiar to the pre-Marcan, Christian community than the synoptic one! But one thing at least is certain: no such messianic self-disclosure was created by those who adhered to the traditions or conceptions concerning the messianic secret found in the Second Gospel.

The crux of the expositor's problem in Mk. II, 1–12 seems to be in the statement "But that ye may know that the Son of man

[5] E.g. J. Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Markus (1949), pp. 59 f.; V. Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p. 199 f.

[6] J. Schniewind maintains that the forgiveness of the sins of the paralytic will have been interpreted in the light of passages like Isai. XXXIII, 24. Jer. XXXI, 34 etc. (op. cit., p. 58); and E. Lohmeyer suggests that it will have been understood in relation to the LXX text of Isai. LXI, 1 (Das Evangelium des Markus, 1951, p. 54).

hath power on earth to forgive sins"; and when this is treated as a declaration to the scribes, it appears to lead to formidable, exegetical obstacles. Perhaps, then, the view that it was an utterance to the scribes is wrong and a false start in attempts to explain the pericope.

The following considerations have an important bearing upon the answer.

(1) The so-called "Messianic Secret" dominates Mark's presentation of the course of Christ's ministry. The evangelist would have the reader understand that the Lord was anxious to withhold the revelation of his Messiahship from the people in general who thronged about him. Even after the Caesarea Philippi incident the disciples are still under an injunction to "tell no man of him." The fact of his office as messianic Son of man is not, indeed, given outright avowal, beyond the circle of the disciples, until the Lord stands before Caiaphas (XIV, 61f.). This view of the course of the life of Jesus in Mark's record is so plain that it seems out of the question that the author understood ch. II, 1–12 as an occasion when Jesus endeavoured to reveal himself to the scribes as Son of man with "power on earth to forgive sins."

(2) The scribes were not amongst those whom the evangelist regarded as appointed to know Christ's divine authority and messianic status. It is most noticeable how intent Mark is upon depicting them, along with the Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, the chief priests and the members of the Sanhedrin, as critical, hostile and blind to him who fulfilled his messianic mission amongst them. As early in the narrative as III, 6, the evangelist records that the Pharisees and Herodians "took counsel against him, how they might destroy him." This implies that all these official representatives of the Jewish nation (as Mark sees them), even more obviously than the multitude of common folk, are οἱ ἔξω to whom "the mystery of the kingdom of God" was not given, but for whom ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται "that seeing they may see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand" (IV, 11f.) They are, in fact, the heads of a nation which Mark looks upon as rejected; and Mk. VIII, 12 and XI, 33 are almost a direct contradiction of the idea that II, 1–12 was interpreted in Marcan circles as an attempt on the

part of Jesus to reveal to the scribes his ἐξουσία on earth to forgive sins.

(3) But whose eyes beheld plainly the full significance of all that Jesus was and achieved? Who did receive such revelation, according to the author of St. Mark? In his account, revelation is for those within the circle of believers — disciples, the Twelve, sometimes Peter, James and John alone; [7] although during the Lord's earthly life revelation was not fully given even to believers. The Twelve themselves often remained dull of understanding. After Easter, however, what had remained still secret was to come clearly to light. Then believers would know in yet greater measure. The rent veil symbolizes the revelational turning-point, and the centurion's confession illustrates that even believing Gentiles will at that time be amongst those who discern the divine nature of the Son of man, who behold the coming of the Kingdom with power (IX, 1) and declare that the exaltation of the rejected Stone to become "the head of the corner . . . is marvellous in *our eyes*" (XII, 11).

(4) No strong reason exists for suspecting composite origin for II, 1–12 outside the contents of verses 10 and 11. In view of the common association of sin with disease in Jewish thought, there is nothing improbable about a miracle story which reported Jesus as commencing a cure by saying "Son, thy sins are forgiven" (II, 5), coming in consequence under the immediate disapproval of the scribes for appearing to assume too much spiritual authority, and finally proceeding to make the reality of the forgiveness clear by completing the healing with the words, "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house" (II, 11). That the erstwhile paralytic should do so, supplied proof of the forgiveness. Verse 12 would then constitute a natural rounding off of the story, erring only in an excusable and fairly obvious overstatement: not quite "all" glorified God — the scribes will have remained hostile. Thus apart from the words "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins," there is nothing unusual about the substance of the whole narrative; and the text also runs smoothly enough throughout II, 1–9. It would indeed continue so with 10b–12, if only 10b originally

[7] Cf. IV, 10f, 34; V, 37; VIII, 17–21, 27–31; IX, 2–9 etc.

began with, say, τότε before λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ as in Mt. IX, 6.

It remains to draw the conclusions to which the above considerations point. (a) There appears good reason to maintain that Mk. II, 1–9, 10b–12 was a unity in the pre-Marcan tradition; and that it reported the healing of a paralytic in the course of which there was a dispute between Jesus and the scribes about the forgiveness of the man's sins. (b) The only significant, editorial adaptation which the narrative has undergone is the interpolation of the words of 10a, "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." When this happened, possibly some small, conjunctive expression like καί or καὶ εὐθύς or τότε was omitted before λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ. (c) In view of Mark's conception of the messianic secret and of believers — not the scribes — as appointed to receive revelation, especially after Easter, the evangelist means the words "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins" as a remark addressed to the Christian readers of the Gospel. This interpolation explained the significance of the closing phase of the healing *for them*. The Lord proceeded to prove the reality of the forgiveness of the paralytic by demonstrating the fact of the cure with the command, "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house." But this he did, not for the benefit of the scribes, but that those who came to believe in him as the Christ should have evidence of the divine authority which was his even in the days of his flesh; the command was given "that ye" Christian readers might "know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." (d) This interpolation could well have been made before Mark used the pericope in his Gospel, and for a like purpose. In that case, II, 10a is the interpretative comment of early expositors who by means of these words brought home to the assembled congregation the true meaning (as they saw it) of the Lord's procedure. It would then represent a piece of stock, Christian exegesis which at some point became an integral part of the whole narrative, before the Second Evangelist included this miracle in his Gospel.[8]

[8] There are of course other passages in St. Mark which might be understood along the lines suggested here for Mk. II, 10a (e.g. II, 28; VII, 3), but I have deliberately refrained from using them in this article.

ATHENAGORAS OR PSEUDO-ATHENAGORAS

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago

In 1936 Henry Lucks could write of Athenagoras' treatise On the Resurrection of the Dead that "it is rather singular that there is no questioning of the authorship of this work, and no hesitancy evident in attributing it to Athenagoras." [1] On the other hand, in 1950 P. Keseling made the following statement after speaking of Athenagoras' Legatio:

> Demselben Verfasser weist eine von der Hand des Erzbischof Arethas selbst herrührende (so Stählin bei Harnack, Lit. 2 1, 317, 4) Eintragung in dem massgebenden Codex Paris. graecus 451 v J. 914 einen Λόγος περὶ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν (Oratio de resurrectione mortuorum), also eine Schrift über die Auferstehung der Toten zu, die jedoch, sonst nirgends bezeugt und aus inneren Gründen nicht unverdächtig, hier ausser Betracht geblieben ist.[2]

The purpose of this paper is to develop the reasons for believing that Athenagoras could not have written the treatise De resurrectione.

I. Not by Athenagoras

In the first place, as Keseling notes, the treatise in Codex Parisinus graecus 451 is not originally ascribed to any author. It follows the Legatio of Athenagoras, but in the archetype bore only the title On the Resurrection. Either Arethas (so Stählin) or the scribe Baanes (so von Gebhardt [3]) prefixed "of the same" to this, and added "of Athenagoras on the resurrection" at the end. It makes no difference which of them made these additions, for in either case they are not copied from the archetype. With Schwartz we may add that "it cannot be known whether Arethas

[1] H. A. Lucks, The Philosophy of Athenagoras (Washington, 1936), 19.
[2] Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum I (1950), 881.
[3] O. von Gebhardt, Der Arethascodex (Texte und Untersuchungen I 3, Leipzig, 1888), 183–85.

found the books of Athenagoras united in one volume or written separately; it is only clear that while the Libellus (Legatio) depends on an archetype thoroughly corrupted in every way, the Oration (on the resurrection) is handed down so integrally and purely that obviously only a very few copies intervene between the author's own hand and the codex of Arethas." [4] This certainly shows that the textual traditions of the two works are quite independent. And the conclusion of Chaudouard, that "in the tenth century this treatise was current as a work of Athenagoras," [5] is erroneous. The correct conclusion is that either Baanes, or more probably Arethas, was the first to propose Athenagoras as the author of the treatise.

In the second place, while at the end of the Legatio (cc. 36–37) Athenagoras does look forward to the composition of a treatise on the resurrection, the view of resurrection here expressed does not correspond to his ideas as set forth in the Legatio. "Spirit" is never mentioned in the treatise, but in the Legatio (31, 3) he says:

> We believe that being "changed" (1 Cor. 15, 51) from this life we shall live another life better than this one, a heavenly one, not an earthly, since we shall be near God and with God, and free from all change and suffering in soul. Even if we have flesh, we shall not be as flesh but as heavenly Spirit.

Again, his conception of the soul's origin is not that of the treatise, where man consists *ab initio* of body and immortal soul united. In Legatio 27, 1 he speaks of the influence of "the spirit of matter" upon the soul; the soul "does not look up to the heavenly regions and their Maker, but looking below to earthly things is wholly depressed to the earth, becoming only blood and flesh, no longer pure Spirit." Its state becomes like that of the fallen angels, who also "were no longer able to look up to the heavenly regions" (Leg. 25, 1). This distinction between heavenly and terrestrial, spirit and flesh, "intelligibles and sensibles" (Leg. 36, 3, in regard to the resurrection), is not reflected in the treatise.[6]

Furthermore, the promise in the Legatio of further discussion

[4] E. Schwartz, Athenagorae libellus pro Christianis. Oratio de resurrectione cadaverum (T. und U. IV 2, Leipzig, 1891), iv.

[5] L. Chaudouard, Étude sur le *περὶ ἀναστάσεως* d'Athénagore (Lyons, 1905), 7.

[6] Contrast Leg. 36, 2 with Res. 18, 5 and 21, 3.

of resurrection involves the use of Platonic and Pythagorean parallels (Leg. 36, 3). Nothing of the sort is found in the treatise, which uses some Platonic language but relies solidly on Aristotelian arguments.[7]

In the third place, the Legatio and the treatise do have many terms in common, even philosophical terms; but there are many words which, as a glance at Schwartz's index will show, are found only in one or the other of the works. We should perhaps not lay too much stress on this point, since the two works are concerned with different subjects; but we should add that Schwartz found "sententiae" and "vocabula quaesita" only in the Legatio and general definitions only in the treatise.[8]

Chaudouard thought that the treatise was written by the author of the Legatio, and he lists some ideas and citations common to both works.[9] There are in both creation by the Logos, divine providence, death as the twin brother of sleep, and the citation "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." This argument may be answered as follows. Creation by the Logos is in fact not mentioned in the treatise. No early Christian writer, or late one either, fails to mention divine providence. The notion of death as the twin of sleep is a Graeco-Roman cliché which we should expect to find anywhere.[10] And nearly all writers who touch on life after death cite 1 Corinthians 15, 32, or Isaiah 22, 13, its source.[11] Chaudouard's list proves nothing.

Our conclusion is that neither external nor internal evidence favors the notion that Athenagoras wrote the treatise on the resurrection.

II. Against Origen

The work Athenagoras intended to write on the resurrection was to be a defence of the doctrine against pagan opponents, but the treatise we have is directed only in part against them. The

[7] Cf. M. Pohlenz in Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 47 (1904), 241–50; L. Alfonsi in Vigiliae christianae 7 (1953), 138–42.

[8] Op. cit., 92.

[9] Op. cit., 8.

[10] Cf. P. Ubaldi–M. Pellegrino, Atenagora (Torino, 1947), 210 n. 1.

[11] Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 5, 13, 4; Clement, Paed. 3, 80, 4; Strom. 1, 59, 4; Tertullian, De res. carnis 49; De ieiun. 17; De monog. 16.

real adversaries the author has in mind are those who have abandoned the truth or distorted it or doubt it (Res. 1, 2). They have left nothing untroubled, not even the being (or substance), knowledge, and activity of God. And they question the resurrection of the body. Such opponents seem to be Christians rather than outsiders.

The author begins his attack with the general statement that some falsehood arises beside every true doctrine; this is based on a dictum of the Academic philosopher Carneades,[12] but turns the dictum from scepticism to the support of dogma. He then states that unfounded disbelief is wrong and that "the probable account" must be favored; this recalls the probabilism of Carneades. And he adds that error must be pruned before the seeds of truth can be sown — a common idea of Middle Platonism [13] and one stressed in the school of Origen.[14] Then he proceeds to classify his opponents' arguments as involving disbelief in the power or the providence of God (Res. 2, 3).

There is one objection to God's power which "seems especially to trouble some persons even of those admired for their wisdom, who have somehow attached undue weight to the doubts of the multitude" (Res. 3, 3). This objection involves the eating of corpses by animals which in turn are eaten by human beings. It was obvious that animals did eat corpses; Seneca, probably reflecting Posidonius, speaks of the departure of the divine spirit from bodies which have such a fate,[15] and Tatian touches on the same point.[16] But the more complicated problem of chain-consumption does not occur in Celsus' criticism of Christian views and it seems to be found first in Origen's commentary on the first psalm.[17] We may assume that Origen is the chief person admired for his wisdom, since we know his reputation not only from the

[12] Numenius, frag. 5, p. 127, 12 Leemans (Eusebius, P. E. 14, 8, 7); cf. Sextus Empiricus, Adv. math. 7, 164. 252. 415. 438; Cicero, Acad. 2, 42; De nat. deor. 1, 12.

[13] Cf. Albinus, Eisagoge 6, p. 150 Hermann (cited by Schwartz).

[14] Gregory Thaumaturgus, Paneg. 93–99, pp. 19–20 Koetschau.

[15] Seneca, Ep. 92, 34 (cited by J. Geffcken, Zwei griechische Apologeten [Leipzig, 1907], 235 n. 9); from Posidonius, A. Schmekel, Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa (Berlin, 1892), 250.

[16] Orat. 6, 2.

[17] In Methodius, De res. 1, 20, 4–5.

address of his admirer Gregory Thaumaturgus but also from both Eusebius [18] and the Neoplatonist Porphyry.[19]

The author's reply involves some physiological information to the effect that only the natural food of an animal is digested by it so that it becomes a part of its body (Res. 5–6). He can see that his argument will not convince everyone — it would not have convinced Origen [20] — and so he adds that risen bodies will be made up of their own parts (they may well consist of wet, dry, warm, and cold elements), but since blood, phlegm, bile, and breath are not parts they will not belong to risen bodies (Res. 7, 1). This distinction is made necessary by the arguments of Origen against the resurrection of the flesh. He had urged that the elements (water, earth, fire, and air) once dissolved could not be restored to make up a human body.[21] And he mentioned such items as blood, phlegm, bile and breath as what only the *simpliciores* would expect to see restored.[22]

Since these parts of the author's argument seem to be directed against or modified by the thought of Origen, we may return to his remarks on the "nature, knowledge, and activity" of God and recall that these are favorite words of Origen, for example in the Commentary on John or De principiis 2, 8, 3 (though this is not a verbal quotation but from the second anathema of the synod of 543).

The author defends himself from a second objection — since human workmen cannot restore broken works, neither can God — which seems thoroughly artificial — by adducing the dogma "more glorious and truest of all," that "what is impossible for men is possible for God" (Res. 9, 2; Luke 18, 27). His description of this dogma sounds like a reply to Origen's remark that in spite of difficulties the *simpliciores* take refuge in "everything is possible for God." [23]

At the end of this section directed against objections, the author argues that resurrection is not unworthy of God because it is not

[18] Gregory Thaumaturgus, Paneg. 110–11 (for physics); Eusebius, H. E. 6, 21, 3.
[19] In Eusebius, H. E. 6, 19, 5.
[20] De princ. 2, 1, 4, p. 109, 17 Koetschau: quodcumque illud est quod per cibum sumpserimus, in corporis nostri substantiam vertitur.
[21] References in H. Chadwick, Harv. Theol. Rev. 41 (1948), 88.
[22] Ibid., 90.
[23] In Methodius, De res. 1, 21, 1.

unjust in regard to any of the persons involved (Res. 10). Again, we may note that Origen held that the idea of physical resurrection involved "unworthy ideas." [24]

We conclude that the criticisms of resurrection refuted by this author are those made by Origen. The resurrection, he says, is possible for God, is willed by him, and is not unworthy of him (Res. 11, 2).

Similarly in the positive proof of resurrection (Res. 12–25) we find reflections of the ideas of Origen as the objects of criticism. The proof is based on four principal points: (1) the cause of man's creation (Res. 12–14); (2) the nature of man as consisting of immortal soul united with body (15–17); (3) the providence of God, shown especially in judgment (18–23); and (4) the goal of man's existence (24–25).

(1) The cause of man's creation cannot be for the sake of God or angels, since they need nothing, nor for beings inferior to man, but must be for man's own sake because of the goodness and wisdom of God. Since this is the cause, man must exist forever, soul and body, to contemplate God's magnificence. This argument seems to be directed against Origen's idea that the human soul is all that matters, and that God imprisoned it in the body for punishment (De princ. 1, 8, 1).

(2) Man's nature is the unity of immortal soul with body, and resurrection is required in order to preserve this nature. To be sure there are changes in the body, but it is the same body and the same life which changes. Here again Origen's doctrine seems to be controverted; he insisted on the primacy of the soul and argued that the human body was essentially fluid; it did not remain the same.[25] Methodius and the Dialogue of Adamantius similarly opposed him.[26]

(3) If God is to be a just judge, he must judge body and soul together, for the body should receive its just reward or punishment, since both passions and virtues belong not only to the soul but also to the body. This can be proved from the commandments

[24] Ibid., 1, 22, 1.

[25] Chadwick, op. cit., 86–87.

[26] Methodius, De res. 2, 12–13 (cf. J. Daniélou in Vigiliae christianae 7 1953, 168–69); Dial. Adamant. 5, 16–17.

(which lead to eternal life according to the gospel), since they (Exodus 20, 13–17) are addressed to both body and soul. Here our author follows Aristotelian lines [27] against Origen, who held that virtues belong to the soul.[28] The same line of argument is used against Origen by Methodius and in the Dialogue of Adamantius.[29]

(4) The goal of man's life cannot be freedom from care or enjoyment of pleasures (here the author touches on philosophical themes already developed by Aristotle [30]), nor can it be the blessedness of the soul separated from the body. But this is, according to Origen, actually the goal of human existence.[31] It must be, says our author, a goal of both body and soul; it must be the contemplation (*theoria*) of the Existent One. This language could have been accepted by Origen,[32] though not with the qualifications our author makes.

We conclude, therefore, that the positive proof of the resurrection of the body is also directed against Origen. It is certainly directed against some Christian opponent since the author refers to "the apostle" (Res. 18, 5) and the law (Res. 23, 2) as authorities. Because he refers to the law he cannot be writing against Marcion or any other of the gnostics who did not accept the authority of the Old Testament. When he says that the commandments of the decalogue "cannot without absurdity be spoken to or understood of souls" (Res. 23, 4), it is obvious that he is writing against some Alexandrian theologian since Clement of Alexandria so understood them.[33]

III. In the Third or Fourth Century

The resemblances of some of our author's points to those made by Methodius and in the Dialogue of Adamantius suggest that he

[27] De anima 403 a 16, 403 b 17 (passions); Eth. Nicom. 1178 a 20 (virtues).
[28] Cf. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Paneg. 122.
[29] Methodius, De res. 1, 31, 6; Dial. Adamant. 5, 21.
[30] Eth. Nicom. 1095 b 20.
[31] Contra Celsum 3, 47. 59; 4, 22; cf. De orat. 9, 2; Comm. in Ioh. 19, 15, p. 315, 22 Preuschen.
[32] Contra Celsum 3, 56; 6, 61.
[33] Strom. 6, 133–48. The author's rejection of pleasure as the goal of life may well be due to Origen's having accused the simpliciores of having this goal; cf. De princ. 2, 11, 2.

is writing in a time approximately the same as theirs. His criticism of those who base their faith in resurrection on the necessity for judgment (Res. 14, 6) suggests that he is acquainted with the treatise De resurrectione by Tertullian, where judgment is the first cause for resurrection.[34] This work comes from around A.D. 208–211, and the works of Origen in which his doctrine of resurrection is developed come from before 231. The panegyric of Gregory Thaumaturgus, to which our author may allude, was delivered after 238. Because of his caution in alluding to Origen himself, we should conclude that he wrote during Origen's lifetime or shortly thereafter, perhaps within the third century.

Thus his treatise on the resurrection somewhat resembles that ascribed to Justin, written about the same time but directed against different opponents.[35] On the other hand, the treatise of Pseudo-Justin may actually be directed against what its author thinks is Origen's position. His opponents argue that (1) it is impossible for the corrupted and dissolved body to be brought together again; (2) it is also unsuitable for this to take place, since it would be unworthy of God; and (3) there is no promise of it in scripture. This is not unlike Origen's view, and the minor arguments are like his. The flesh must rise complete, for a purpose (e.g., conception and insemination), or incomplete (men one-eyed and lame). This dilemma suggests that it does not rise. Moreover, the substance of the flesh is earth; it is full of sin and forces men to sin. Here Origen's views are — or may be — parodied. Actually we cannot prove that Pseudo-Justin is directed against Origen. But it is worth noting that in the tradition such a work is ascribed to a second-century "philosopher" or rather apologist. We may suggest that a similar ascription was made in the case of Athenagoras.

IV. Conclusion

Our conclusion is this: the treatise on the resurrection of the dead which was ascribed by one tenth-century writer (or two?)

[34] De res. carnis 14.

[35] Text in K. Holl, Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela (T. und. U. XX 2, Leipzig, 1899), 36–49; cf. F. R. M. Hitchcock in Zeitschr. f. die neutest. Wiss. 36 (1937), 41–60.

to Athenagoras is not actually one of his works. Instead, it is a product of the third or early fourth century and is directed against Origen's doctrine of resurrection.

Confirmation of such a date for the treatise is provided in its 19th chapter.

> Would the robber or potentate who has unjustly slain thousands upon thousands pay requital for them by one death? And one who holds no true doctrine of God but lives a life of total insult and blasphemy, despises divine things, dissolves the laws, and has insulted women along with children, has unjustly overthrown cities, has burned up houses along with their inhabitants, and has devastated the countryside, and at the same time has extinguished citizens and peoples and nearly an entire race — how would he pay suitable requital in his perishable body?

The person to whom the author refers is evidently the emperor Galerius, whose governor in Phrygia ordered the burning of a whole Christian town together with its inhabitants.[36] The author's picture of this person strongly resembles that of Galerius given by Lactantius in his treatise De mortibus persecutorum. And from the use of the present tense we can probably infer that the treatise was written shortly before Galerius' death in the spring of 310. The treatise belongs to the anti-Origenist literature which impelled Pamphilus and Eusebius to write their Apology for Origen.

[36] Eusebius, H. E. 8, 11, 1; cf. N. H. Baynes in Cambridge Ancient History XII (1936), 674.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni. Series II. Sectio II., Vol. I(VII) — Fasc. 4. Romae, Sumptibus PP. Basilianorum, 1953.

Ancient Israel. *By Harry M. Orlinsky.* Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press [c. 1954] viii, 193 p.

Annuaire de L'École des Législations Religieuses (Institut Catholique de Paris) II, 1951–1952. Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1953. 101 p. bibliographical footnotes. (At head of title: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Droit Canonique de Paris.)

Die Bücher Genesis-Exodus; Eine Rhythmische Untersuchung. *Von D. Arvid Bruno.* Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell [1953] 327 p.

The Book of Psalms; the Hebrew Text and the English Authorized Version with a New Hebrew Commentary Beur Joshua, *by the late scholar Oscar Joshua Simons.* New York, Published by his children, The Simons Family, 1953. 97 p. port.

Christendom Attacked; a comparison of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. *By Conrad Bonifazi.* London, Rockliff [c. 1953] xv, 190 p.

The Conception of the Inner Light in Robert Barclay's Theology; a Study in Quakerism. *By Leif EEG-Olofsson.* Lund, CWK Gleerup, 1954. 258 p. bibliographical footnotes. (Studia Theologica Lundensia, 5)

A Concise History of the Law of Nations. *By Arthur Nussbaum.* Revised Edition. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1954. xii, 376 p.

Court Traite de Theologie Mariale. *De René Laurentin.* Paris, P. Lethielleux, [1953]. 187 p.

Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, Ascétique et Mystique, Doctrine et Histoire. Fondé par M. Viller, F. Cavallera, J. De Guibert, S.J. Continué au Nom de la Faculté de Théologie D'Enghien (Belgique) sous la Direction de Charles Baumgartner, S.J., Assisté de M. Olphe — Galliard, S.J. avec le Concours d'un Grand Nombre de Collaborateurs. Tome II Cabasilas. — Cyrille de Scythopolis, Paris, Beauchesne, 1953.

Dumbarton Oaks Papers Number Seven. Edited for the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection of Harvard University, Washington, D. C. *By the Committee on Publications.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1953. 141 p.

L'Évêque Dans la Tradition Pastorale du XVI^e^ Siècle. *Par Paul Broutin, S.J.*; adaptation française de "Das Bischofsideas der Katholischen Reformation," *par Hubert Jedin.* [Paris] Desclée De Brouwer, 1953. 138 p. (Museum Lessianum. Section Historique, 16)

Les Epitres Catholiques de Saint Jacques, Saint Jude et Saint Pierre. *Traduites par R. Leconte.* Paris, Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1953. 108 p. bibliographical footnotes. (La Sainte Bible)

Foi et Histoire. Etude Comparative de la Conception Chrétienne et de la Conception Moderne de l'Histoire. [*Par*] *Reinhold Niebuhr.* Traduction française *de Marcel J. Brun.* Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé S.A., 1953. 231 p. (Bibliothèque Théologique)

George Herbert; His Religion and Art. *By Joseph H. Summers.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1954. 147 p.

The Greek Attitude to Poetry and History. *By A. W. Gomme.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1954. vi, 190 p. front. bibliographical footnotes.

Habaquq: Abdias: Joël. *Traduits par J. Trinquet.* Paris, Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1953. 91 p. bibliographical footnotes. (La Sainte Bible)

The History and Character of Calvinism. *By John T. McNeill.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1954. x, 466 p.

L'Homme Dans L'Ancien Testament. [*De*] *Georges Pidoux.* Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé S.A., 1953. 75 p. bibliographical footnotes. (Cahiers Théologiques, 32)

L'Homme et L'Argent (Nova et Vetera). [*De*] *Jacques Ellul.* Neuchatel, Delachaux et Niestlé S.A. [c. 1954] 220 p. (Collection "L'Actualité Protestante")

Introduction a L'Etude des Manuscrits Grecs. *De Robert Devreesse.* Ouvrage publié avec le concours du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1954. viii, 344 p. plates.

Jeremia: Eine Rhythmische Untersuchung. *Von D. Arvid Bruno.* Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell [1954] 282 p.

Jesaja; Eine Rhythmische Und Textkritische Untersuchung. *Von D. Arvid Bruno.* Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell [1953] 354 p.

Judaism: Postbiblical and Talmudic Period. Edited with an Introduction and Notes *by Salo W. Baron and Joseph L. Blau.* New York, Liberal Arts Press [c. 1954] xxvi, 245 p. (The Library of Religion, Vol. 3)

Kitab-E Jami'al-Hikmatain; Le Livre Réunissant les Deux Sagesses ou Harmonie de la Philosophie Grecque et de la Théosophie Ismaélienne. [*Par*] *Nasir-e Khosraw.* Texte persan édité avec une double Étude Préliminaire en français et en persan *Par Henry Corbin et Moh. Mo'in.* Teheran, Département d'Iranologie de l'Institut Franco-Iranien, 1953. 144, 348 p. facsim. (Bibliothèque Iranienne, 3)

Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift. *Redigerad av Gunnar Westin.* Femtiotredje Argangen. Uppsala Och Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1953. (Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Kyrkohistoriska Fëreningen, I:53)

A Lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas, Based on the *Summa Theologica* and Selected Passages of His Other Works. *By Roy J. Deferrari and Sister M. Inviolata Barry* with the Technical Collaboration of Ignatius McGuiness. [Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Fascicle III. I–M and Fascicle IV, N–Q.

Le Livre de L'Ecclésiastique; *Traduit par Dom Hilaire Duesberg, et Paul Auvray.* Paris, Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1953. 216 p. bibliographical footnotes. (La Sainte Bible)

Les Livres de Samuel. *Traduits par R. DeVaux.* Paris, Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1953. 238 p. bibliographical footnotes. (La Sainte Bible)

"O Livro Dos Milagres de Nossa Senhora da Oliveira" de Afonso Peres. [Introduçao e Texto] *Por Mário Martins.* Guimaraes, 1953. [Separata do volume LXIII da "Revista de Guimaraes." 57 p.

Love, Power, and Justice. Ontological Analyses and Ethical Applications. Given as Firth Lectures in Nottingham, England and as Sprunt Lectures in Richmond, Virginia. *By Paul Tillich.* New York and London, Oxford University Press, 1954. viii, 125 p.

Man's Hidden Search; An Inquiry into Naturalistic Mysticism. *By Kenneth L. Patton.* Boston, Meeting House Press [c. 1954] 123 p.

La Mère Virginale du Sauveur. *Par M. J. Scheeben. Traduit de l'allemand par A. Kerkvoorde.* [Paris] Desclée De Brouwer [1953] 217 p. front.

The Mind's Road to God. *By Saint Bonaventura. Translated, with an introduction, by George Boas.* New York, Liberal Arts Press [1953] 163 p. Lutterworth Studies in Church and Bible)

Miscelanea Comillas; Colaboración Científica de los Profesores y Doctores de la Universidad. Comillas (Santander) Universidad Pontificia, 1953. 329 p. illus. bibliographical footnotes. (Pontificia Universitas Comillensis, XX)

Morale Chrétienne et Requêtes Contemporaines. Tournai, Casterman, 1954. 291 p. (Cahiers de L'Actualité Religieuse)

Mózes Harmadik Könyve; Levitikus — A Levitak Könyve; *Károlyi Gáspár*; Forditása és czeglédy sándor reviziója nyomán a Héber Eredetiböl Forditotta. A Magyar Bibliatanács Ószövetségi Szakbizottsága. Budapest, A Magyarországi Református Egyház Egyetemes Konventjének Sajtóosztálya, 1953. 40 p. bibliographical footnotes.

Mozes Masodik Könyve; Exodus — A Kivonulas Könyve. *Károlyi Gáspár*; Forditása és czeglédy sándor reviziója nyomán a Héber Eredetiböl Forditotta. A Magyar Bibliatanács Ószövetségi Szakbizottsága. Budapest, A Magyarországi Református Egyház Egyetemes Konventjének Sajtóosztálya, 1953. 53 p. bibliographical footnotes.

Oeuvres Philosophiques et Mystiques de Shihabaddin Yahya Sohrawardi. (Opera Metaphysica et Mystica II) I. 1. La Théosophie de l'Orient des Lumières (arabe). — 2. Le Symbole de Foi des Philosophes (arabe). — 3. Le Récit de l'Exil occidental (arabe et persan). Prolégomènes en français et édition critique [*par*] *Henry Corbin*. Teheran, Department d'Iranologie de l'Institut Franco-Iranien, 1953. v. 1. (Bibliothèque Iranienne, 2)

Omelie Mariologiche di S. Giacomo di Sarug. Introduzione, Traduzione dal Siriaco e Commento [*per*] *Costantino Vona*. Romae, Facultas Theologica Pontificii Athenaei Lateranensis, 1953. 273 p. bibliographical footnotes. (Lateranum. Nova Series. An. XIX, N. 1–4)

Origen's Doctrine of Tradition. *By R. P. C. Hanson*. London, S. P. C. K., 1954. xi, 213 p.

Le Origini di Gesù in Rapporto Alla Storia del re Erode e al Messianismo da Daniele a S. Paolo. *By Gaetano Baglio*. Napoli, Libreria Internazionale Treves di Leo Lupi, 1939. viii, 203 p.

The Pattern of God's Truth: Problems of Integration in Christian Education. *By Frank E. Gabelein*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1954. 118 p.

People's Padre: An Autobiography. *By Emmett McLoughlin*. Boston, Beacon Press [c. 1954] 288 p. illus.

Peregrinaçoes e Livros de Milagres na Nossa Idade Média. *Por Mário Martins*. Coimbra, 1951. 154 p. (At head of title: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de Estudos Historicos Doutor António de Vasconcelos.)

Personal Religion among the Greeks. [*By*] *André-Jean Festugière, O.P.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1954. viii, 186 p. front. (Sather classical lectures, v. 26)

Le Psautier Romain et les Autres Anciens Psautiers Latins. Édition critique. *Par Dom Robert Weber*. Roma, Abbaye Saint-Jérome, 1953. xxiii, 410 p. (Collectanea Biblica Latina, Vol. X)

Realms of Value; A Critique of Human Civilization. *By Ralph Barton Perry*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University Press, 1954. xii, 497 p. bibliographical footnotes.

Repertorium Lexicographicum Graecum. A Catalogue of Indexes and Dictionaries to Greek Authors. [*By*] *Harald and Blenda Riesenfeld*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1953. 95 p. (Coniectanea Neotestamentica, XIV)

Le Role du Laicat Dans L'Eglise. *Par G. Philips*. Tournai, Casterman, 1954. 248 p. (Cahiers de L'Actualité Religieuse)

St. John Damascene: Dialectica: Version of Robert Grosseteste. *Edited by Owen A. Colligan*. St. Bonaventure, N. Y., The Franciscan Institute, 1953. 63 p. (Franciscan Institute Publications. Text Series No. 6)

Spiritus et Veritas. Editit Auseklis, Societas Theologorum Universitatis Latviensis, 1953. xiv, 196 p. (Festschrift for Karl Kundzins)

The Strenuous Puritan: Hugh Peter 1598–1660. *By Raymond Phineas Stearns.* Urbana, University of Illinois, 1954. x, 463 p. front. (port.) bibliographical footnotes.

Les Stromates [*de*] *Clément D'Alexandrie.* Stromate II. Introduction et notes *de P. Th. Camelot,* Texte Grec et Traduction *de Cl. Mondésert.* Paris, Éditions Du Cerf, 1954. 144 p. bibliographical footnotes. (Sources Chrétiennes, 38)

The Student's New Testament; The Greek Text and the American Translation. [*Edited by*] *Edgar J. Goodspeed.* [Chicago] University of Chicago Press [1954] x, 1055 p.

Summae Quaestionum Ordinariarum Theologi Re Cepto Preconio Solennis Henrici a Gandauo, cum Duplici Repertorio, Tomos Posterior. [St. Bonaventure, N. Y., The Franciscan Institute, 1953] n.p. (Franciscan Institute Publications. Text Series No. 1) (Reprint of the 1520 edition, Vol. II)

La Theologie Catholique au Milieu du XX^{e} Siècle. *De Roger Aubert.* Tournai, Casterman, 1954. 101 p. (Cahiers de L'Actualité Religieuse)

The Theology of Al-Ash'arī; The Arabic Texts of Al-asha'arī's Kitāb al-Lumá and Risālat Istiḥsān al-Khawḍ fī 'Ilm al-Kalām, with briefly annotated translations, and Appendices containing material pertinent to the study of al-Ash'ari. [*Translated by*] *Richard J. McCarthy, S.J.* Beyrouth, Imprimerie Catholique, 1953. xv, 275, 109 p.

La Tradition; Problème Exégétique, Historique et Théologique. Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé, S.A. 1953. 54 p. bibliographical footnotes. (Cahiers Théologiques, 33)

Traditional Embroideries from the Holy Land and from Norway. *Arranged by Heinz Edgar Kiewe.* With contributions by Grace M. Crowfoot: *Christian Arab Embroideries*; Violet Barbour: *Muslim Arab Embroideries*; Irene Roth: *Jewish Yemenite Artisans,* Oxford, By permission of the British Council, Black Hall, St. Giles (Banbury Road). 24 p. illus. (Illustrated Art Catalogue 2'6)

At head of title: 'Craftsman and Designer' (Fifth Exhibition)

As Ujszovetseg Konyvei 1951–1952. *Károlyi Gáspár*; fordítása és czeglédy sándor reviziója nyomán a Görög eredetiből forditotta. A Magyar Bibliatanács Újszövetségi Szakbizottsága. Budapest, A Magyarországi Református Egyház Egyetemes Konventjének Sajtóosztálya, 1951–1952. v.p.

The Writings of St. Luke; Brief notes on the material peculiar to the writings of St. Luke and on the possibility of the Acts of the Apostles being composed before the third gospel. *By Roland Koh. With a foreword by The Bishop of Hongkong.* Hongkong, Diocesan Literature Committee, 1953. 100 p. map. bibliographical footnotes.

Zum Grammatischen Verständnis von Matth. 12,44 v. [*von*] *H. S. Nyberg*; Zum Partizip Matth. 24,41. [*von*] *Harald Riesenfeld.* 16 p. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup, 1949. (Coniectanea Neotestamentica, XIII)

WILLARD LEAROYD SPERRY

Born, at Peabody, Massachusetts, April 5, 1882
Died, at Boston, Massachusetts, May 15, 1954

Forty-two years ago Dean Sperry contributed to the Harvard Theological Review 'The Eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels: Its Fidelity to Religious Experience (V, 1912, 385 ff.), his first theological paper. This was followed by his beautiful study of Mark Rutherford (VII, 1914, 166 ff.) and by other articles; among these 'The Call to the Ministry' (XV, 1922, 217 ff.) made a particular impress. The Harvard Theological Review is deeply in his debt for these things, even as it is for his twenty years of service on the Editorial Board and for his unfailing helpfulness in all its problems. The Divinity School, the University, and the far wider community that has gained so much from his personality and his spoken and written word have cause for unbounded gratitude.